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# \*\*Neg UQ + Links\*\*

## Top-Shelf

### 1NC Immigration DA

#### a.) Uniqueness and internal link – CIR will pass – but bipartisanship is key to effective compromise

AP 7/8/13 (“Congress Is Back: Here's What's on the Bickering Agenda”, <http://www.cnbc.com/id/100871129>, CMR)

In the GOP-controlled House, courteous behavior, even within the majority ranks, has barely been perceptible with the ignominious failure of the farm bill. Some collaboration will be necessary if the House is to move ahead on immigration legislation this month.¶ Conservatives from safe, gerrymandered House districts have rebuffed appeals from some national Republicans who argue that embracing immigration overhaul will boost the party's political standing with an increasingly diverse electorate, especially in the 2016 presidential election. Those conservatives strongly oppose any legislation offering citizenship to immigrants living here illegally.¶ Reflecting the will of the rank and file, House Speaker John Boehner of Ohio and other Republicans have said the comprehensive Senate immigration bill that couples the promise of citizenship for those living here unlawfully with increased border security is a nonstarter in the House.¶ Opening the Senate session on Monday, Reid urged the House to consider the Senate bill—a highly unlikely step.¶ "Now it's our duty to convince our colleagues in the House, yes, they should vote with us," he said. "Bipartisan immigration reform that includes a pathway to citizenship makes economic and political sense."¶ House Republicans were assessing the views of their constituents during the weeklong July 4th break and planned to discuss their next steps at a private meeting Wednesday.¶ Rep. Michael McCaul, R-Texas, chairman of the House Homeland Security Committee, said Republicans would be hashing out "two key hot spots" in the meeting: the pathway to citizenship and health care.¶ "We need to be the party of solutions and not always obstructing, and so I think there's an effort here that we ... need to fix this immigration system," McCaul said Sunday on CBS' "Face the Nation." He predicted that the full House could take up immigration as early as this month, and that representatives from both chambers could be working to resolve differences in their versions late this year or early next.¶ The House Judiciary Committee has adopted a piecemeal approach, approving a series of bills, none with a path to citizenship that Obama and Democrats are seeking. Democrats hope the single-issue bills get them to a conference with the Senate, where the prospects for a far-reaching overhaul improve.¶ "I think what you're finding is that there will be a compromise, a smart compromise," Rep. Xavier Becerra, D-Calif., said Sunday, also on CBS. "You have to be smart. You have to be tough. But you have to be fair. And if you can do that, you'll have a full fix."

#### b.) Link – [insert one specific to affirmative case you are debating…or]

#### Major shifts in policy towards Latin America cause partisan battles

Whitehead & Nolte 12 (Laurence Whitehead, senior research fellow in politics at Nuffield College, Oxford, and Detlef Nolte, acting president of the GIGA, director of the GIGA Institute of Latin American Studies, professor of political science at the University of Hamburg, Number 6, 2012, <http://www.giga-hamburg.de/dl/download.php?d=/content/publikationen/pdf/gf_international_1206.pdf>, CMR)

US–Latin America relations are routinely managed by multiple bureaucratic agencies, which can act quite autonomously and are often not coordinated via a common ¶ strategy. Obama’s Latin America policy has frequently been hampered by political ¶ polarization and partisan divisions in Congress. „ The intermestic dimension of US–Latin American relations has complicated foreign ¶ policy, because a more self-confident and autonomous majority in Latin America ¶ has sometimes sought a policy shift with regard to highly sensitive topics, such as ¶ drugs, immigration and Cuba.¶ „ One issue area where some would criticize the Obama administration is its slowness ¶ in improving relations with Brazil or placing Brazil on par with, for example, India.¶ „ It is unlikely that Latin America’s modest ranking in US foreign policy will increase ¶ or that Washington’s priorities will shift much after the November 2012 elections.

#### c.) Impact – CIR is key to the economy and competitiveness

Green 7/2 - founder and president of FWD.us, an advocacy group created by technology leaders that promotes policies to keep the United States and its citizens competitive in a global economy (Joe, “House, knowledge economy needs immigrants”, <http://www.cnn.com/2013/07/02/opinion/green-immigration-reform/index.html>, CMR)

Our country has changed a lot during those 27 years, but not -- so far -- our immigration policy. Suffice it to say, if we can pass our generation's immigration reform, it will be a really big deal.¶ America's greatest asset has always been its people, drawn here from all over the world. In the 21st century, our economic future depends on immigrants more than ever. The fastest-growing sector of our economy is the knowledge economy, where the main competitive difference is people.¶ In a globalized world where people and businesses have their choice of countries to locate in, continuing to have the best trained, hardest-working and most productive people in the world will keep the United States at the forefront of global competitiveness. We have some huge advantages: the top universities in the world, the top scientific researchers, and -- right alongside these -- our identity as a nation of immigrants and descendants of immigrants.¶ At FWD.us, a nonprofit advocacy group, we are entrepreneurs, and we believe that one of the main reasons America is the leading entrepreneurial nation is that we are a nation of immigrants. Leaving behind your home country and everything you know to create a better life for your family is the essence of the risk-taking that characterizes the entrepreneurial ethos.¶ I think back to my ancestors in the shtetls of Eastern Europe in the 19th century. They had probably never been more than two miles from their village, and got on a steamship to go to a country they had never even seen in a picture, knowing they would never return home.¶ That is truly putting it all on the line to make a better life. It is not random, who chooses to emigrate, and the work ethic and entrepreneurial spirit of these immigrants have shaped the character of our country. Entrepreneurs in Silicon Valley do not just identify with the experience of computer programmers coming to America to work at tech companies, but with everyone who comes here to make a better life. It's why we are working for comprehensive immigration reform.¶ There are talented young people in America who were brought here by their parents who now cannot go to college or work because they are undocumented. These DREAMers are just waiting to contribute, and their parents, with the right accountability measures, should be able to join them by coming out of the shadows and contributing fully to their communities.¶ In addition, we know that the best and the brightest come here to study, start companies and create jobs that grow our economy; millions more are caught in limbo navigating a complex and broken system that is totally outdated for a modern economy and modern American families. We need to pass comprehensive immigration reform to unlock those contributions and by doing so change millions of lives.

#### d.) Collapse of the US economic power causes nuclear war

Khalilzad 11 Zalmay was the United States ambassador to Afghanistan, Iraq, and the United Nations during the presidency of George W. Bush and the director of policy planning at the Defense Department from 1990 to 1992, “ The Economy and National Security”, 2-8-11, <http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/print/259024>, CMR

Today, economic and fiscal trends pose the most severe long-term threat to the United States’ position as global leader. While the United States suffers from fiscal imbalances and low economic growth, the economies of rival powers are developing rapidly. The continuation of these two trends could lead to a shift from American primacy toward a multi-polar global system, leading in turn to increased geopolitical rivalry and even war among the great powers. The current recession is the result of a deep financial crisis, not a mere fluctuation in the business cycle. Recovery is likely to be protracted. The crisis was preceded by the buildup over two decades of enormous amounts of debt throughout the U.S. economy — ultimately totaling almost 350 percent of GDP — and the development of credit-fueled asset bubbles, particularly in the housing sector. When the bubbles burst, huge amounts of wealth were destroyed, and unemployment rose to over 10 percent. The decline of tax revenues and massive countercyclical spending put the U.S. government on an unsustainable fiscal path. Publicly held national debt rose from 38 to over 60 percent of GDP in three years. Without faster economic growth and actions to reduce deficits, publicly held national debt is projected to reach dangerous proportions. If interest rates were to rise significantly, annual interest payments — which already are larger than the defense budget — would crowd out other spending or require substantial tax increases that would undercut economic growth. Even worse, if unanticipated events trigger what economists call a “sudden stop” in credit markets for U.S. debt, the United States would be unable to roll over its outstanding obligations, precipitating a sovereign-debt crisis that would almost certainly compel a radical retrenchment of the United States internationally. Such scenarios would reshape the international order. It was the economic devastation of Britain and France during World War II, as well as the rise of other powers, that led both countries to relinquish their empires. In the late 1960s, British leaders concluded that they lacked the economic capacity to maintain a presence “east of Suez.” Soviet economic weakness, which crystallized under Gorbachev, contributed to their decisions to withdraw from Afghanistan, abandon Communist regimes in Eastern Europe, and allow the Soviet Union to fragment. If the U.S. debt problem goes critical, the United States would be compelled to retrench, reducing its military spending and shedding international commitments. We face this domestic challenge while other major powers are experiencing rapid economic growth. Even though countries such as China, India, and Brazil have profound political, social, demographic, and economic problems, their economies are growing faster than ours, and this could alter the global distribution of power. These trends could in the long term produce a multi-polar world. If U.S. policymakers fail to act and other powers continue to grow, it is not a question of whether but when a new international order will emerge. The closing of the gap between the United States and its rivals could intensify geopolitical competition among major powers, increase incentives for local powers to play major powers against one another, and undercut our will to preclude or respond to international crises because of the higher risk of escalation. The stakes are high. In modern history, the longest period of peace among the great powers has been the era of U.S. leadership. By contrast, multi-polar systems have been unstable, with their competitive dynamics resulting in frequent crises and major wars among the great powers. Failures of multi-polar international systems produced both world wars. American retrenchment could have devastating consequences. Without an American security blanket, regional powers could rearm in an attempt to balance against emerging threats. Under this scenario, there would be a heightened possibility of arms races, miscalculation, or other crises spiraling into all-out conflict. Alternatively, in seeking to accommodate the stronger powers, weaker powers may shift their geopolitical posture away from the United States. Either way, hostile states would be emboldened to make aggressive moves in their regions.

### 1NC – Heg Impact

#### \*\*Note – From the original 1NC, alternative to the new economy impact

#### Immigration reform is key to the economy, competitiveness, and hegemony

Shapiro 3/27 --- president and CEO of the Consumer Electronics Association, the U.S. trade association representing more than 2,000 consumer electronics companies (Gary, “Tech Executives: Immigration Reform a Top Priority”, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/garyshapiro/2013/03/27/tech-executives-immigration-reform-a-top-priority/>, CMR)

Today I join hundreds of leaders in business, finance, technology and policymaking in Silicon Valley for the 2013 Global Technology Symposium. This year’s theme is “Entrepreneurship in the Global World,” a timely subject given the technology community’s leadership in supporting skilled-immigration reform, an issue intertwined with entrepreneurship and America’s standing in the global economy.¶ Entrepreneurship is a key component of “ninja innovation,” a term I coined to describe the principles we must embrace if we’re going to success in business, politics or our personal lives. I look forward to talking more about this important connection at the symposium tonight, but at the core of the discussion is a simple truth: More than being entrepreneurial individuals, we must foster a culture of entrepreneurship in America. That includes finding ways to attract and keep the world’s best and brightest innovators in America to develop products, launch companies, and create jobs.¶ CEOs from AT&T, Cisco, eBay, Facebook, Google, Intel and Yahoo! have led a steady drumbeat in Washington to reform America’s skilled-immigration system. They understand why reform is vital to our nation’s economic well-being.¶ It fuels job creation.¶ A recent study found that the average foreign-born student who graduates from a U.S. university and works in a STEM field – science, technology, engineering and mathematics – will create about 2.62 jobs for American workers.¶ Creating an immigration system that welcomes the world’s best and brightest is not only crucial to our nation but also to the San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara economy, home to thousands of STEM jobs. A 2011 Bureau of Labor Statistics report finds that STEM occupations accounted for at least 15 percent of total jobs in this area – that’s more than three times the percentage for the U.S. as a whole.¶ That’s why earlier this month, more than 100 executives from the technology sector and leading innovation advocacy organizations, including my organization, the Consumer Electronics Association (CEA)®, signed a letter to President Obama and Congress urging them to create a more open and flexible U.S. immigration system that embraces highly skilled workers.¶ Cisco Chairman and CEO John Chambers said it best, “America’s success has been based upon its ability to attract the best, brightest, and most ambitious individuals. Our country needs a modern immigration policy that further fosters this culture to help spur continued technological innovation and economic growth.”¶ The problem is clearest in the technology industry because of the incredible shortage of qualified workers. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, there are tens of thousands of unfilled jobs requiring highly skilled individuals in STEM fields. Among four top tech firms – IBM, Intel, Microsoft and Oracle – there are 10,000 jobs waiting to be filled.¶ Our outdated and inefficient immigration system is a huge contributor to the shortage. Many high-skilled, foreign-born workers want to come to or stay in America and create jobs here, but our restrictive visa laws send them home after they’ve trained in our universities. Silicon Valley has felt the pain of these policies through a drop in the number of startups founded by foreign-born immigrants. In the past seven years, immigrants founded 43.9 percent of startups, down from 52.4 percent in 2005. Pushing these individuals to the back of the immigration line creates an incentive for them to compete against us by working for other companies abroad.¶ Instead, we should implement reforms like the Immigration Innovation Act, which would nearly double the number of H-1B visas for high-skilled foreign workers.¶ Other measures, like the Start-Up Visa Act, introduced in the Senate, would also encourage innovation here in the U.S. while investing in education for those in STEM fields. These policy prescriptions were included in the tech leaders’ letter to President Obama and Congress as ways to start the debate and come to a compromise. But that doesn’t mean that if Congress and the President fail to enact them the technology industry will not surrender its fight for reform.¶ The Startup Act 3.0 would enhance America’s global competitiveness by encouraging more entrepreneurialism and halt the U.S. brain drain by creating a STEM visa program for up to 50,000 immigrants each year who graduate from U.S. institutions with a master’s or Ph.D. in STEM. It would also create an entrepreneur visa for up to 75,000 immigrant entrepreneurs who register a business, hire at least two non-family member employees, and invest in their business within one year of obtaining the visa.¶ These policy prescriptions were included in the tech leaders’ letter ways to start the debate and come to a compromise. If Congress and the President fail to enact them, the technology industry will keep fighting for reform.¶ After all, the understanding that strategic immigration is good for our economy is gaining traction among the broader public as well. A recent survey found that there is strong desire among likely voters to have an open and flexible immigration system that embraces highly skilled workers. It also found broad support for research and development programs and a stronger federal focus on STEM education. This may be because Americans are becoming increasingly worried that we are losing our global advantage. More Americans believe that the next major technological innovation will come from China (43 percent) rather than from America (30 percent).¶ With the support of most Americans and the bold leadership of tech industry executives, skilled immigration reform should be a no-brainer in Washington. Bipartisan reform is an important and remarkably easy way to help create jobs and innovation at home. We need to keep America in a position of global leadership, and reforming our country’s immigration law is the first step.

#### Collapse of US leadership causes great power war and extinction

Barnett 11 (Thomas P.M., Former Senior Strategic Researcher and Professor in the Warfare Analysis & Research Department, Center for Naval Warfare Studies, U.S. Naval War College American military geostrategist and Chief Analyst at Wikistrat., worked as the Assistant for Strategic Futures in the Office of Force Transformation in the Department of Defense, “The New Rules: Leadership Fatigue Puts U.S., and Globalization, at Crossroads,” March 7, CMR)

Events in Libya are a further reminder forAmericans that we stand at a crossroads in our continuing evolution as the world's sole full-service superpower. Unfortunately, we are increasingly seeking change without cost, and shirking from risk because we are tired of the responsibility. We don't know who we are anymore, and our president is a big part of that problem. Instead of leading us, he explains to us. Barack Obama would have us believe that he is practicing strategic patience. But many experts and ordinary citizens alike have concluded that he is actually beset by strategic incoherence -- in effect, a man overmatched by the job. It is worth first examining the larger picture: We live in a time of arguably the greatest structural change in the global order yet endured, with this historical moment's most amazing feature being its relative and absolute lack of mass violence. That is something to consider when Americans contemplate military intervention in Libya, because if we do take the step to prevent larger-scale killing by engaging in some killing of our own, we will not be adding to some fantastically imagined global death count stemming from the ongoing "megalomania" and "evil" of American "empire." We'll be engaging in the same sort of system-administering activity that has marked our stunningly successful stewardship of global order since World War II. Let me be more blunt: **As the guardian of globalization**, **the U.S. military has been the** greatest force for peace the world has ever known. **Had America been removed from the global dynamics that governed the 20th century**, the **mass murder never would have ended**. Indeed, it's entirely conceivable **there would now be** no identifiable human civilization left**, once** nuclear weapons **entered the killing equation.**  But **the world did not keep sliding down that path of perpetual war**. **Instead, America stepped up and changed everything by ushering in our now-**perpetual great-power peace. **We introduced the international liberal trade order known as** globalization and played loyal Leviathan over its spread. **What resulted was the collapse of empires,** an explosion of democracy, the persistent spread of human rights, the liberation of women, the doubling of life expectancy, a roughly 10-fold increase in adjusted global GDP **and a profound and persistent reduction in battle deaths from** state-based conflicts. That is what American "hubris" actually delivered. Please remember that the next time some TV pundit sells you the image of "unbridled" American military power as the cause of global disorder instead of its cure. With self-deprecation bordering on self-loathing, we now imagine a post-American world that is anything but. Just watch who scatters and who steps up as the Facebook revolutions erupt across the Arab world. While we might imagine ourselves the status quo power, we remain the world's most vigorously revisionist force. As for the sheer "evil" that is our military-industrial complex, again, let's examine what the world looked like before that establishment reared its ugly head. The last great period of global structural change was the first half of the 20th century, a period that saw a death toll of about 100 million across two world wars. That comes to an average of 2 million deaths a year in a world of approximately 2 billion souls. Today, with far more comprehensive worldwide reporting, researchers report an average of less than 100,000 battle deaths annually in a world fast approaching 7 billion people. Though admittedly crude, these **calculations suggest a 90 percent absolute drop and a** 99 percent **relative** drop in deaths due to war. We are clearly headed for a world order characterized by multipolarity, something the American-birthed system was designed to both encourage and accommodate. But given how things turned out the last time we collectively faced such a fluid structure, **we would do well to keep U.S. power, in all of its forms**, deeply embedded in the geometry to come. To continue the historical survey, after salvaging Western Europe from its half-century of civil war, the U.S. emerged as the progenitor of a new, far more just form of globalization -- one based on actual free trade rather than colonialism. America then successfully replicated globalization further in East Asia over the second half of the 20th century, setting the stage for the Pacific Century now unfolding.

## UQ

### Will Pass – 2NC UQ Wall

#### Passage likely – GOP is just gathering bargaining chips – AFF authors overstate opposition

Ward 7/10 (Jon, “Immigration Doom And Gloom Is Giving John Boehner Some Room To Operate”, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/07/10/immigration-john-boehner_n_3573669.html>, CMR)

Immigration reform is not dead. The doom and gloom is being fed, at least in part, by GOP leadership, to help position them politically for the coming fight.¶ One of the key GOP players of the reform effort, Rep. Mario Diaz-Balart (R-Fla.), said in an interview Wednesday morning that he still thinks Congress can pass something through both chambers that President Barack Obama will sign.¶ "I think we're going to get to conference and I think we're going to pass something ultimately. I really do. This is not always a calm, pretty process. The legislative process never is. But I ultimately think we're going to get something done. I really do," he said. "How we get there, I think we have a long way to go. But I'm frankly still very optimistic. I've never thought that this was going to be an easy process."¶ Why is there so much talk that the process is dead, then?¶ "There was an over blown euphoria, for months, that, 'Hey, this is done.' Well the reality is that nothing is done until something is sent over to the president's desk. And that's a very difficult, long process," Diaz-Balart said.¶ Diaz-Balart, whose congressional district stretches from the western suburbs of Miami across the southern tip of Florida to the Gulf Coast, has been part of a bipartisan group of House members meeting all year to try to reach an agreement. And he is correct that for much of the early part of this year, immigration reform was viewed as a fait accompli.¶ It's also true that two things have become clear over the last month or so. First, there is significant opposition to a path to citizenship within the House Republican conference, and deep distrust of the process for reconciling legislation between the House and Senate, called the conference committee process. And second, conservatives have reconsidered the knee jerk reaction they had to last fall's presidential election and have decided -- with the help of a four-part series by Real Clear Politics' Sean Trende -- the logic of a widespread argument, that "immigration reform equals reconciliation with Hispanics equals avoiding extinction as a party," was not as rigorous or accurate as they first thought.¶ Respected conservative voices like The New York Times' Ross Douthat have laid out arguments this week explaining why this is a moment for the GOP to avoid what he sees as a short cut to resurgence. He says it's an opportunity for the party to do the hard work of reconfiguring and rethinking its economic arguments, in order to reach a broader group of voters than just Hispanics and become more populist.¶ But if there is a desertion on the right from the John McCain/Lindsey Graham school of thought that the GOP must pass a bill or die, that could, counterintuitively, work in favor of reform. If there is some consensus that their party is not being forced to do anything, but that there is still a genuine problem that needs fixing, that might change the mood a bit and ease some of the distrust on the hard right.¶ A question then would be how to resolve opposition among House conservatives to the Senate bill's path to citizenship.¶ "If we can get a secure border, and more than just a promise or a committement but a pathway to a secure border ... I believe across the board, tea party groups, all groups, would support some kind of a robust program to allow people to work here. Not get citizenship, but allow them to be able to work here," Rep. Matt Salmon (R-Ariz.) said last month.

#### There’s momentum for passage but sustained bipartisanship is key

Eaton 7/10 (Emilie, “Dems push as GOP weighs next steps on immigration reform”, Cronkite News Service, <http://www.tucsonsentinel.com/local/report/071013_dems_immig_reform/dems-push-as-gop-weighs-next-steps-immigration-reform/>, CMR)

President Barack Obama met with members of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus to talk about the issue Wednesday. White House spokesman Jay Carney said in an afternoon briefing that that while passing comprehensive immigration reform will be an “uphill battle,” there is greater momentum for immigration reform.¶ The GOP statement came after House Republicans met behind closed doors late Wednesday afternoon to talk about the next steps on immigration reform. In a joint statement from House leaders after that meeting, they said the House would continue its own approach to immigration reform instead of taking up the Senate bill.¶ “Today, House Republicans affirmed that rather than take up the flawed legislation rushed through the Senate, House committees will continue their work on a step-by-step, commonsense approach to fixing what has long been a broken system,” said the statement from House Speaker John Boehner’s office.¶ Republicans in the Arizona delegation did not immediately return calls Wednesday about the next steps for immigration reform in the House.¶ But Democratic members of the Border Caucus insisted that a comprehensive bill would be better than a piecemeal approach on economic, humanitarian and other fronts.¶ Rep. Raul Grijalva, D-Tucson, one of the Hispanic Caucus members who met with Obama earlier Wednesday, said a necessary component of comprehensive immigration reform is a pathway to citizenship and an emphasis on humanitarian efforts.¶ Grijalva said more than 5,700 people have died along the border in the last 10 years, 2,700 in Arizona alone. That calls for humanitarian efforts, like targeting human trafficking, he said.¶ Border Caucus members stressed the economic advantages of comprehensive reform, and the president did likewise in his meeting with Hispanic lawmakers, pointing to a July report on the economic benefits of fixing the immigration system.¶ “It’s about border security, but it’s also about economic security,” House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi said at the Border Caucus event.¶ Six million American jobs depend on trade from Mexico, which is the nation’s third-largest trading partner, said Rep. Filemon Vela, D-Texas.¶ “The symbolic nature of constructing more fence along the border of a country with whom we have such great business relationships doesn’t make any sense,” Vela said.¶ But amendments to the Senate bill call for $40 billion in border-security improvements, including the addition of 18,000 Border Patrol agents and 700 miles of new fence.¶ Rep. Beto O’Rourke, D-Texas, said the House should take some of that $40 billion and redirect it to to economic growth and trade. Doing so would create jobs and generate billions of dollars in economic activity, he said.¶ “And really at the end of the day, Republican or Democrat, that’s why we’re here – to create jobs, to create opportunities, to create economic growth,” O’Rourke said.¶ Democrats agreed with Carney that there is some momentum behind reform efforts. It’s time for the House to to continue that momentum in a bipartisan manner, they said.¶ “Two weeks ago the Senate passed a bipartisan bill,” Pelosi said. “We hope now that the House will act, again in a bipartisan way.”

#### Will pass – Boehner and Ryan are building momentum

Berman 7/10/13 (Russell, “Boehner warns House GOP will be weaker without immigration reform”, <http://thehill.com/homenews/house/310259-boehner-gop-would-be-in-much-weaker-position-without-action-on-immigration>, CMR)

Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) and Rep. Paul Ryan (R-Wis.) urged their House Republican colleagues to pass immigration reform legislation in a closed-door meeting Wednesday, with the Speaker arguing his conference would be “in a much weaker position” if it failed to act.¶ A divided House Republican conference met for more than two hours in the basement of the Capitol to begin hashing out a response to the sweeping immigration bill the Senate passed last month.¶ Boehner spoke at the outset of the meeting and reiterated his pledge that no immigration bill, including a final House-Senate conference report, would come to the floor without the support of a majority of the House GOP. But both he and Ryan, the House budget chief and the GOP’s vice presidential nominee in 2012, made the case that the House GOP should take action on immigration in a way that reflected the party’s principles, Republicans in the room said.¶ Boehner “said we’d be in a much weaker position if we didn’t act,” according to Rep. Tom Cole (R-Okla.). “He clearly wants to act, thinks something needs to get done. Frankly, our principles are probably closer to where the American people are, but it’s incumbent upon us to act.”¶ The party leadership did not lay out a timetable for floor votes in the meeting, though members indicated leaders could develop a timeline in the coming weeks.¶ Members said it was likely that the House would wait until after the August congressional recess to act, although votes on individual border security and interior enforcement bills that have passed out of committee were possible before then.¶ Following the meeting, Ryan said he was optimistic the House would act.¶ “I think our members are ready to tackle this issue. It needs to be fixed,” he told reporters. “There is an emerging consensus that our immigration system is broken, that we need to fix it, and we need to do it in a very thorough way.¶ “I feel very good. I feel we are in very good position to do it the right way. We don't want to rush anything,” he said before diving into a crowded elevator.

#### The bill will pass- multiple reasons

Barro 7-10 (Josh, Politics Editor for Business Insider, “IT'S ALIVE: Stop Saying Immigration Reform Is Dead,” http://www.businessinsider.com/its-alive-stop-saying-immigration-reform-is-dead-2013-7, ME”

I jumped the gun last month when I wrote a piece with the unfortunate headline "IT'S OVER: Comprehensive Immigration Reform Is Going To Pass."¶ Obviously, immigration reform is on the rocks. But its death is being greatly exaggerated in the media.¶ Republicans and Democrats in Congress both have reasons to signal inflexibility on the content of an immigration bill, regardless of how inflexible they actually are.¶ Speaker John Boehner needs to convince Democrats that Republicans are willing to kill the bill without major policy concessions. Democrats, like Chuck Schumer, need to convince Republicans that they are willing to let the bill die rather than give up desired elements like the pathway to citizenship.¶ Jon Ward of the Huffington Post lays out how this needle could theoretically be threaded. It would involve replacing the Path to Citizenship which so alarms many House Republicans with something less, along the lines of Sen. Rand Paul's "No New Path To Citizenship" proposal.¶ You can call it a Pathway to Legalization—unauthorized immigrants would get the right to stay in the country legally and could pursue citizenship if they become eligible through existing legal channels, but would not get a separately established right to apply for Permanent Resident status after 10 years.¶ I spoke this afternoon with Sean West, Director of Eurasia Group's U.S. practice, who is reiterating his call that there is a 60% chance of immigration reform's passage this year. But he thinks the bill that passes may not involve a path to citizenship.¶ There are two key questions about this approach: Could it be acceptable to a majority of House Republicans, and could Democrats swallow hard and accept it? The answer to both is maybe.¶ Rep. Bob Goodlatte (R-Va.), who chairs the House Judiciary Committee and is generally viewed as an immigration skeptic, favors such an approach. So does Paul, who ended up voting against the Senate bill because of concerns about the path to citizenship and border security.¶ A path to legalization without citizenship would satisfy the needs of Republican-aligned business interests, which just want to be able to hire immigrant workers. And it could calm worries among Republicans wary of granting citizenship to members of a likely Democratic voting block.¶ Of course, Democrats have repeatedly insisted that immigration reform isn't comprehensive if it doesn't contain a path to citizenship. But if they're presented with a bill that serves most of their other goals, will they really turn it down? There are a few reasons they shouldn't.¶ Legalization would lead to a major advance in quality of life for unauthorized immigrants even if it didn't come with a path to citizenship. A substantial fraction of newly-legalized immigrants would later become eligible for citizenship through existing channels, such as marriage to a citizen or sponsorship by a relative, even without a special path.¶ Perhaps most importantly, legalization would bring formerly unauthorized immigrants out of the shadows and enable them to lobby for a path to citizenship in the future. Even the path to citizenship in the Senate immigration bill wouldn't lead to the creation of any new U.S. citizens until 2026. Democrats will almost surely control the whole federal government at some point between now and then, so if there's no path to citizenship in an immigration bill passed this year, they will likely be able to enact one later.¶ Of course, that reason for Democrats to accept a bill with no path to citizenship is a reason for Republicans to resist passing one. But there are still good reasons for House Republicans to feel they have to pass something.¶ Business interests and the Republican elites that align closely with them desperately want an immigration bill. They haven't given up: Grover Norquist, Al Cardenas and Doug Holtz-Eakin came out with another letter yesterday urging Boehner to pass something.¶ If the House doesn't pass any immigration bill, they will have to take all of the blame for reform getting defeated, alienating not just Hispanics but many of the top funders of Republican politics.¶ When I asked this morning on Twitter about the last time Republican elites fought so hard for something and got rebuked by their own elected officials, the proffered examples were not on point: TARP. "Plan B" for the fiscal cliff. This year's farm bill.¶ House Republicans defected on TARP and changed their mind less than two weeks later. When Plan B got defeated, Boehner had no choice but to let a substantively similar (actually, farther left) bill pass with mostly Democratic votes. Everybody expects the House to eventually pass a farm bill, too. In each case, the elites eventually got (or will get) more or less what they want.¶ If House Republicans pass a bill with no path to citizenship, they'll be able to accurately tell business interests that they passed legislation addressing their priorities, Hispanics that they voted for a bill that changes immigration in a way that substantially betters the lives of immigrants, and conservatives that they didn't just roll over to Democratic priorities. The politics are drastically better than not passing anything at all.¶ And passing such a bill would put Democrats in a challenging political position. Can Schumer really make good on his threat not to go to conference with a House bill that doesn't have a path to citizenship? If he did, he'd give Republicans an opening to credibly declare that Democrats killed immigration reform because they'd rather have a political issue than a law that advances many, if not all, of their policy objectives.¶ A lot of the discussion around immigration reform has focused on two possible outcomes: passage of a bill substantially identical to the Gang of Eight approach, or no bill. But the possibility of a bill that is more limited in scope and more attuned to Republican interests should not be discounted. Don't call immigration reform dead yet.

#### Will pass due to momentum – but not without a fight

Gonzalez 7/8/13 (Rocio, “Conservatives stand behind immigration reform at crucial moment”, <http://www.voxxi.com/conservatives-support-immigration-reform/#ixzz2YaGpjFx1>, CMR)

Congress is back from their 4th of July recess this week, and many — perhaps millions — are waiting anxiously to see what happens to immigration reform in the House of Representatives.¶ While some — such as Sen. Chuck Schumer (D-N.Y.) — are optimistic about the House passing immigration reform soon, Republican attitudes in the chamber they control indicate the fight is going to be tougher than anticipated.¶ But although some House Republicans have been outspoken in their opposition to the pathway to citizenship and other aspects of the immigration reform bill passed by the Senate, conservatives in and outside Washington are making it clear that they support immigration reform, and it is time for Congress to get its act together.¶ A familiar face resurfaces¶ Former President George W. Bush has been quiet in the years after leaving office, with only few details about his life after the White House surfacing. Most recently, Bush was in the news when his presidential library was inaugurated. Now, he’s stepping back into the spotlight to support immigration reform.¶ The Republican — who supported Sen. Harry Reid’s immigration reform proposal in 2007 — is set to deliver keynote remarks at a citizenship ceremony held at his presidential library on Wednesday, and he is expected to make the case for immigration reform.¶ Bush has already begun advocating for comprehensive immigration reform this time around when he appeared yesterday on ABC’s “This Week.”¶ “I think it’s very important to fix a broken system, to treat people with respect, and have confidence in our capacity to assimilate people,” he said.¶ Meanwhile, the conservative American Action Network just launched a new ad focused on supporting the border surge included in the Senate immigration reform package.¶ Although this isn’t the first time the group supports immigration reform this way, it is the first time they focus on getting this bill through the House. The ad urges citizens to call Congress and support “conservative immigration reform.” Titled “Surge,” it will run nationwide during primetime on Fox News and will be complemented by a digital ad campaign in Washington, D.C.¶ Activists in place to defend and promote immigration reform¶ Groups lead by CASA in Action have planned a manifestation to take place outside the U.S. Capitol on Wednesday afternoon — when the House Republican Conference is set to have a special meeting during which it is expected the group will decide how to proceed on immigration reform. House Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) already said he will not move forward to consider the Senate bill or other immigration reform measures such as S.744 if the majority of Republican representatives don’t support it.¶ CASA in Action is expecting hundreds of families to gather on the Hill for the “Rally for Citizenship.” In a press release, organizers emphasized that the fact that conservatives — such as former Florida Gov. Jeb Bush and Sens. John McCain (Ariz.) and Marco Rubio (Fla.) — are standing behind immigration reform underscores the “growing recognition” that Republicans need to pass immigration reform for them to survive.

#### Will pass due to momentum – proponents are building support

Dann 7/9/13 (Carrie, “After Senate immigration marathon, House signals narrow path”, <http://nbcpolitics.nbcnews.com/_news/2013/07/09/19374503-after-senate-immigration-marathon-house-signals-narrow-path>, CMR)

Pro-reform groups are keeping up efforts to maintain momentum. ¶ Organizations like the Evangelical Immigration Table, a coalition of faith groups supporting immigration reform efforts in Congress, are working to broaden support for House action. According to Matt Staver, the chairman of Liberty Counsel, about a half dozen religious organizations, including the National Hispanic Christian Leadership Council and the Southern Baptist Association, are lobbying House members to move forward with some kind of legislation, whether it’s the Senate bill or a separate House effort.¶ “As long as they’re [the House members] willing to engage in the dialogue and keep moving forward, I’m okay if they want to start over again,” said David Cooper, a Christian school president and another member of the coalition. “I’m not endorsing a single bill that’s out there right now, but I am standing behind the general principle that the Evangelical Immigration Table has put forward.”¶ Republican proponents of comprehensive reform also haven't given up the fight for a bill that includes a path to legalization for undocumented immigrants – a central tenet of the Senate bill and a non-negotiable component of any legislation for Democrats on both sides of the aisle.¶ Three prominent conservatives – Douglas Holtz-Eakin of the American Action Forum, Grover Norquist of Americans for Tax Reform and Al Cardenas of the American Conservative Union – implored Boehner in an open letter to "to take up a comprehensive package of immigration reforms – be it one bill or many – that secures our border, increases the legal flow of workers, and deals sensibly with the undocumented population."

#### New campaign by Democrats will sway House Republicans

Foley 7/9/13 (Elise, “Democrat Immigration Campaign Targets House Republicans”, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/07/09/democrat-immigration-campaign_n_3568271.html>, CMR)

WASHINGTON -- The Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee is targeting House Republicans with an ad on immigration reform that serves as a greatest hits of sorts of Republicans' controversial statements on the topic, from disparaging "wetbacks" to dismissing "anchor babies."¶ House Republicans are holding a meeting on Wednesday to discuss their approach to immigration reform, after the Senate passed a bipartisan bill 68 to 32 last month. House Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) has vowed not to take up the bill, and there are indications his conference won't agree to a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants -- possibly dooming reform because Democrats say they can't support a bill without it.¶ Democrats believe some Republicans can be convinced to support reform, and the congressional campaign committee will run its ads Tuesday and Wednesday in districts of those perhaps persuadable GOP members. The video mockingly predicts some of the things that might come up in the meeting, based on quotes from the members who will be in the room. "This is how we imagine the conversation will go," it begins.

#### New memo will create a path for House passage – vote count

Sargent 7/8/13 (Greg, “Can immigration reform pass the House? Maybe.”, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/plum-line/wp/2013/07/08/can-immigration-reform-pass-the-house-maybe/>, CMR)

Reform advocates and Democrats on the Hill are not ready to give up just yet, and they are quietly circulating a new memo that details a list of House Republicans they believe may — may — be gettable in support of reform.¶ The list and memo, which you can check out right here, is meant as a very broad, and admittedly optimistic, look at the full range of House Republicans whose support should not be completely ruled out just yet.¶ The idea here is that if Speaker John Boehner does, in the end, allow a vote on the Senate bill, or something else that does contain a path to citizenship, you would need only a few dozen House Republicans to support it for it to pass, since most House Dems would vote for it. Boehner has publicly ruled that out, but there are some grounds for doubting whether a decision has actually been made. From the memo:¶ If there is a vote on comprehensive immigration reform with a path to citizenship in the House, it will pass with a bipartisan majority. If all but a handful of the House Democrats vote yes, and at least 20 Republicans from the list below come along, reform can easily clear the 218 necessary to pass the lower chamber. Looking at the list of 99 House Republicans below, it’s clear that capturing those 20 or so Republican votes is well within reach. Our target list includes several different groups of Republicans, such as:¶ \* Republicans with growing numbers of Latino and Asian constituents. While redistrictring has temporarily insulated many House Republicans from the “demographic cliff” their party faces if it caters only to white voters, at least 38 Republican members of Congress represent heavily Latino districts — and approximately 25 GOP memberes are in diverse swing districts where the growing Latino, Asian, and immigrant vote is crucial. These include California Republicans Jeff Denham, David Valadao, Gary Miller, Buck McKeon and Devin Nunes; Colorado Republican Mike Coffman; Florida Republicans Mario Diaz-Balart and Illeana Ros-Lehtinen (both of whom are longtime supporters of immigration reform); New York Republicans Peter King and Michael Grimm; and Nevada Republican Joe Heck.¶ \* Republicans with agricultural or high-tech interests in their districts. Both the agriculture and high-tech sectors urgently need immigration reform to secure a 21st Century workforce. Republicans who should support reform for the economic well being of their districts include Judiciary Chairman Bob Goodlatte, Spencer Bachus, and Sam Johnson, all of whom represent agriculture-heavy districts, and Darrell Issa, whose district includes tech interests.¶ The memo goes on to list several leading figures in the House GOP who have already backed immigration reform for the long term good of the party, such as Paul Ryan, Greg Walden, and Raul Labrador. The full list is here.

#### Immigration will pass if with bipartisan agreement

Mali 7/7 (Meghashyam, contributor to The Hill, “Bush sees lawmakers ‘making progress’ on immigration reform,” <http://thehill.com/blogs/blog-briefing-room/news/309449-bush-heartened-to-see-congress-making-some-progress-on-immigration>, ME)

Former President George W. Bush pressed lawmakers to act on comprehensive immigration reform and expressed confidence they were “making some progress” on the contentious issue during an interview aired Sunday on ABC’s "This Week."¶ “I think it's very important to fix a broken system, to treat people with respect, and have confidence in our capacity to assimilate people,” Bush told ABC’s Jonathan Karl in an interview taped last week during his visit to Africa. “It's a very difficult bill to pass because there's a lotta moving parts. And the legislative process is-- can be ugly. But it looks like they're making some progress.”¶ The Senate last month passed a comprehensive immigration bill, but Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) says the House will adopt its own legislation. Immigration reform faces an uphill climb in the House, where many Republicans are opposed to efforts to grant illegal immigrants a pathway to citizenship and say the bipartisan Senate proposals do little to tighten border security.¶ A bipartisan House group is working on its own proposal, but Boehner has warned he will not move legislation unless it has the support of a majority of the GOP conference.¶ During his presidency, Bush sought to pass immigration reform, but his proposal was defeated in Congress.¶ Bush said that failure had left him “frustrated.”¶ “I thought the plan I'd laid out on both was reasonable. But sometimes it takes time for some of these complex issues to evolve. And it looks like immigration's, you know, has a chance to pass.”¶ Many Republicans are pressing their party to join with Democrats to pass immigration reform, arguing that failing to do so could cost them Hispanic voters in national elections. Bush said that the political calculus did not enter into his decision to support reform.¶ “Well, the reason to pass immigration reform is not to bolster a Republican party, it's to fix a system that's broken,” said Bush. “Good policy yields good politics as far as I'm concerned.”

#### Will pass now- many groups pushing

Hunt 7/7 (Albert, Bloomberg View columnist, “U.S. Tilts Progressive on Immigration and Gay Marriage,” <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-07-07/u-s-tilts-progressive-on-immigration-and-gay-marriage.html>, ME

On immigration, it’s instructive to talk to strategists of the two parties: Republicans are squirming over the House leadership threat to kill the Senate-passed bill, and Democrats are unified and exuberant. Senate Democrats unanimously supported the bill, as did 30 percent of Republicans, including some conservatives such as Arizona’s Jeff Flake, Orrin Hatch of Utah and Marco Rubio of Florida.¶ A majority of the House today almost certainly supports a measure that would resemble the Senate legislation. The rationale of the Republican leadership is that it needs a majority of the majority party. Try selling that to voters, especially in the Hispanic community.¶ The Senate bill, which probably involved more political concessions than necessary, is a step forward and commands support from an impressive coalition: the business community, especially the high-tech industry; labor, Hispanic and civil rights groups; top current and former Republican governors; many evangelicals, and even a few right-wingers.¶ Immigration Momentum¶ House Republicans will feel the heat from this diverse crowd. This isn’t a reprise of 2007; immigration reform won’t die.

#### CIR will pass, groups are pressuring Republicans who are likely to vote for it

Nevarez, 7/5 (Griselda, July 5, 2013, “Immigration Reform Advocates Prepare For The Tough Road Ahead”, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/07/05/immigration-reform-advocates_n_3550153.html>, 7/8/2013, PB)

FIRM recently joined a coalition of several groups—including the Service Employees International Union (SEIU) and Mi Familia Vota—to spend more than $1 million on a pro-immigration reform campaign.¶ The campaign, which launched Tuesday, consists of organizing congressional office visits, registering people to vote for the 2014 midterm election and launching radio ads. Those efforts are focused on 11 House Republicans who will be key in passing immigration reform. Seven of them hold important leadership positions and four of them are in purple districts that have a sizable population of Latino voters.¶ Among the House leadership targets are: Speaker John Boehner of Ohio, Majority Leader Eric Cantor of Virginia, Majority Whip Kevin McCarthy of California, Chief Deputy Whip Peter Roskam of Illinois, House Oversight and Government Reform Committee Chairman Darrell Issa of California, National Republican Congressional Committee Chairman Greg Walden of Oregon and House Republican Conference Chairwoman Cathy McMorris Rodgers of Washington.¶ The other four House Republican targets include: House Armed Services Committee Chairman Buck McKeon of California, Mike Coffman of Colorado, Dan Webster of Florida and Michael Grimm of New York. All four face reelection in purple districts where Latinos account for about 20 percent of the population.

#### CIR will pass, several republicans have a sizable Latino population and will vote yes on CIR to be reelected.

Nevarez, 7/5 (Griselda, July 5, 2013, “Immigration Reform Advocates Prepare For The Tough Road Ahead”, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/07/05/immigration-reform-advocates_n_3550153.html>, 7/8/2013, PB)

Additional groups have their own plans to push for immigration reform next week, as the immigration debate heats up in the House.¶ One of those groups is America’s Voice. The pro-immigration reform group will join the polling firm Latino Decisions next week to release survey results that will show several competitive congressional races where the Latino vote could swing the elections. The survey results will help advocates know which House members to pressure to support immigration reform.

#### CIR will pass, Republicans will agree to a compromise when they realize that they can’t pass their own Immigration Reform Bill

Berman 7/3 (Russell, July 3, 2013, “No pressure on House Republicans to tackle immigration reform”, <http://thehill.com/homenews/house/309049-no-pressure-on-gop-to-tackle-immigration>, 7/8/2013, PB)

They’re going to feel a desire to get this done quickly,” an architect of the Senate bill, Sen. Charles Schumer (D-N.Y.), said on “Fox News Sunday.” He argued the House would be unable to pass its own bill and would eventually relent and accept the Senate proposal, a scenario Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) has ruled out in no uncertain terms.

#### CIR will pass, Democrats are no longer pushing for same-sex provisions in the bill

Navias 7/9 (Patricio, 7/9/2013, “Immigration reform faces same-old hurdles”, <http://www.buenosairesherald.com/article/135569/immigration-reform-faces-sameold-hurdles>, 7/9/2013, PB)

The immigration reform bill that cleared the Senate resulted from a compromise between moderate Republicans and Democrats. Democrats agreed not to push the issue of same-sex spouses’ eligibility for family reunification visas. The recent Supreme Court ruling that stroke down the Defence of Marriage Act (DOMA) has made liberal democrats more optimistic about the prospects of future Supreme Court rulings that would end all type of federal discrimination against same-sex couples. Since the number of states legalizing same-sex marriage is likely to increase, liberal democrats were willing to acquiesce to excluding same-sex marriage provisions from immigration reform. After all, if same-sex marriage continues to make progress at the state level, eventually immigration laws will also catch up. Liberal democrats are willing not to put the immigration reform under attack from Republicans if they expect that the Supreme Court will eventually rule that the federal government cannot discriminate against same-sex couples.

#### Republicans are quickly getting onboard with the idea of immigration reform as they come to realize the net benefits of the bill.

Hamby, 2013 (7/1) (Peter, bachelor's degree in English from Georgetown University and a master's degree in journalism from New York University, “GOP chief: 'We need comprehensive immigration reform'” CNN: Political Ticker, http://politicalticker.blogs.cnn.com/2013/06/28/gop-chief-we-need-comprehensive-immigration-reform/, LL)

Washington (CNN) - One day after the Senate passed a full-spectrum immigration bill with overwhelming support, the chairman of the Republican National Committee re-emphasized the need for reform but said the final contours of the legislation are far from settled.¶ "We need comprehensive immigration reform," RNC Chairman Reince Priebus told CNN in an interview in his Capitol Hill office. "I don't think we can continue to drift along with this mess of immigration laws that we have. And a mess that in many regards has been the results of our government not even enforcing the laws that are in place. There is plenty of blame to go around for why we are in this position, but I think it's about time that we address it."¶ The immigration overhaul would create a path to citizenship for millions of undocumented immigrants, raise the cap on visas for high-skilled workers, and boost security along the U.S.-Mexico border, was approved Thursday by a 68-32 vote, with 14 Republicans supporting the measure.¶ The Senate bill, though, is not expected to pass muster in the Republican-controlled House, where a conservative-dominated caucus stands waiting in staunch opposition to the measure.¶ Despite that reluctance – and outspoken criticism from some leading conservative figures and Senate Republicans who opposed the bill - Priebus said "it's clear that there is pretty broad consensus in the party, in the Republican Party, that we need comprehensive immigration reform."¶ Priebus said that House Speaker John Boehner is unlikely to take up the Senate bill and instead craft a package that could be approved by the House before being taken back to Senate negotiators.¶ "My understanding is that the House is going to draft its own version of an immigration bill that they see as either a better fix for comprehensive immigration reform, or something that is reflective of the Republican majority of the House, and then potentially go to conference, and potentially have a conclusion," he said.¶ "I know the leadership in the House is committed to putting something pretty comprehensive together that's going to address the issue," he said.¶ Priebus, challenged with making his party appealing to a Hispanic electorate that favored President Obama by a stunning 3-1 ratio in the 2012 election, credited Republicans for helping push the immigration bill over the Senate finish line.¶ He pointed specifically to Florida Sen. Marco Rubio's decision to work inside the bipartisan "Gang of Eight" that crafted the legislation before taking it to the full Senate.¶ "One thing I think is pretty clear," Priebus told CNN. "We wouldn't have been in this place without Republicans being at the table pushing for immigration reform. And I think this conversation would never be happening without Marco Rubio."

#### Bush states that the immigration reform bill is on the path of being passed which will cause other Republicans to support the cause.

Steinhauser, 2013 (7/7) (Paul, “Bush pushes for progress on immigration” CNN, http://politicalticker.blogs.cnn.com/2013/07/07/bush-pushes-for-progress-on-immigration/, LL)

As House Republicans convene this week to discuss their next steps on immigration reform, former President George W. Bush underscored the importance of fixing a "broken system." While noting the political controversy surrounding the bill, he said immigration reform "has a chance to pass."¶ "It's a very difficult bill to pass because there are a lot of moving parts, and the legislative process can be ugly, but it looks like they are making some progress," Bush told ABC in an interview taped in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. Bush has been in Zambia to help renovate a clinic that serves as a cervical cancer screening and treatment center.¶ Asked if it will hurt the GOP if Republicans fail to pass the bill, Bush said, "The reason to pass immigration reform is not to bolster a Republican Party, it's to fix a system that's broken."¶ "Good policy yields good politics as far as I'm concerned."¶ The former Republican president tried but failed to pass immigration reform during his second term in the White House, thanks in part to opposition from members of Congress from his own party.¶ Bush will deliver a speech on immigration at his presidential library in Dallas at an event titled "What Immigrants Contribute" on Wednesday, the same day House Republicans will meet to discuss their next steps on the issue.¶ Bush was also asked whether his views have evolved on same-sex marriage in light of recent Supreme Court decisions, but insisted he's "not going to wade back into those kinds of issues."¶ "I'm out of politics. The only way I can really make news is either criticize the president, which I don't want to do; criticize my own party; or wade in on a controversial issue," Bush said.¶ The former president met with President Barack Obama in Tanzania on Tuesday before the interview to talk about the Emergency Program for AIDS Relief, a program started by Bush during his first term. The two attended a wreath-laying ceremony commemorating the 1998 U.S. Embassy attack in Dar es Salaam, which killed 11 people, wounding hundreds. On the same day, a separate blast at the U.S. Embassy in Nairobi, Kenya, killed more than 200 people and wounded close to 5,000.¶ Bush said when he spoke to Obama, he reminisced about similar, long trips during his own presidency.¶ "I remember how tired I used to get, and I said, 'You've got to be kind of worn out.' He said, well, he's had a great trip, looking forward to getting back home."¶ "And I asked him about his little girls - were they having a good time? He said, 'You bet,'" Bush said of Obama's daughters, Sasha and Malia, who accompanied first lady Michelle Obama and the president on the trip.¶ "I remember bringing our daughters on some of these trips, and how meaningful it was to be with them," Bush said, adding that there was no talk of policy.

#### CIR will pass both houses

Richardson 6/13/13 (Charles, “Immigration reform edges forward in the US”, http://blogs.crikey.com.au/worldisnotenough/2013/06/13/immigration-reform-edges-forward-in-the-us/)

Yesterday morning (Australian time) the United States Senate held its first vote on comprehensive immigration reform. It wasn’t on the bill itself, only a motion to proceed to debate – no-one thinks that the current bill is going to be the final version – but it was still an impressive success: with 60 votes needed, the closure motion had 82 in favor and only 15 (all Republicans) against.¶ For their different reasons, both sides want a reform bill passed. For the Obama administration it would be another significant legislative achievement and would provide a path to citizenship for millions of unauthorised immigrants – who, not irrelevantly, might be expected to eventually vote Democrat. For the Republicans, it’s an essential step to try to prove to the voting public, particularly Hispanics, that they are not a bunch of crazy racists.¶ Speaking shortly before the Senate vote, the president pushed strongly for reform, calling the present system “broken” and saying it “hasn’t matched up with our most cherished values.” He made it clear that the bill as it stands is a compromise – “nobody is going to get everything that they want” – but indicated that he was basically happy with it and that, as he put it, “there’s no reason Congress can’t get this done by the end of the summer.”¶ Getting something like the present bill through the Senate won’t be very difficult. The problem is the House of Representatives, where the Republicans hold a majority and where Republican representatives tend to be further to the right and more beholden to nativist voters than their colleagues in the Senate.¶ Even so, the numbers are almost certainly there in the House as well, given that if the Democrats vote solidly they only need 17 Republicans to vote with them for a majority. But the Republican leadership, and particularly speaker John Boehner, have the power to prevent a measure they disapprove of being put to a vote.¶ So the current manoeuvring on the bill is mostly about what needs to be done to win over the House Republican leaders. Interviewed on ABC News this week, Boehner said “I would expect that a House bill will be to the right of where the Senate is,” but seemed clearly open to the idea of a bill being allowed to pass the House with only minority support among Republicans. There is a limit to how far he can go in this direction without alienating his rank-and-file, but if they are going to overthrow him then immigration is probably not the most likely issue.¶ The question then arises whether Republican attempts to amend the bill in the Senate, by the likes of John Cornyn and Rand Paul (both of whom voted to let debate proceed), are genuine moves for a compromise that’s necessary for its ultimate passage, or are really intended to sink reform by producing a bill that Democrats will be unable to support.¶ Molly Ball in the Atlantic looks at just that question, concluding that although some Republicans are irreconcilable, some like Paul are willing to support real reform: “reform proponents aren’t giving up on getting Paul’s vote, though they wonder how high a price they’ll be forced to pay for it.”¶ Jon Chait at New York magazine, who of course is no friend to the Republicans, is more confident that the party has no choice but to accept comprehensive reform:¶ [C]onservatives have not generated anything like the kind of outrage on immigration reform they need to overcome their party elite’s desire to pass a bill. In particular, they have oddly failed to organize around the one chokehold they control, Boehner’s ability to keep a bipartisan bill off the floor. It’s almost as if [Rush] Limbaugh and other conservative entertainers are themselves going through the motions, trying to maintain the loyalty of their own audience while failing to apply the pressure they actually need against the party leadership.

#### Will pass – bipartisan momentum

Dickerson 6/24 (John, “An overwhelming majority of senators hopes to bully the house into passing immigration reform”, <http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/politics/2013/06/senate_immigration_reform_vote_how_a_70_vote_bipartisan_majority_might_not.html>, CMR)

Later this week, the Senate will pass comprehensive immigration reform, and that’s supposed to give the bill momentum in the House. "We’re working to get a very substantial bipartisan majority," said Republican Sen. John Hoeven. "That’s going to help in terms of actually getting the bill all the way through the House and into law." Democratic Sen. Chuck Schumer, a member of the Senate Gang of Eight that has crafted the bill, and also a former member of the House, says that, "Having a significant number of Republicans will change the dynamic in the House."

#### Momentum theory confirms our argument – strong Senate passage will overcome all existing hurdles and lock-in House passage

Dickerson 6/24 (John, “An overwhelming majority of senators hopes to bully the house into passing immigration reform”, <http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/politics/2013/06/senate_immigration_reform_vote_how_a_70_vote_bipartisan_majority_might_not.html>, CMR)

Momentum Theory is based on the principle that the more votes the bill gets in the Senate, the better the bill is. The rare coming-together of both parties in the Senate might make low-information voters think the bill is in the category of other unassailable good things senators support in large majorities: the American military, national holidays, and Social Security checks. If people don't see Republicans and Democrats collapsing into their usual predictable squabbles—particularly on such a contentious issue—that must mean the path they've agreed on is a wise one. If Momentum Theory is true, polls should show voters increasingly behind the measure. That would pressure those House members whose opposition to reform is not absolute but flavored with some concern about the public will or the national image of the Republican Party. This is why supporters of reform are pushing to run up the Senate vote total to build the bandwagon feeling. On CNN, Schumer took this theory to its stratospheric conclusion, claiming that if the Senate bill is blocked it would result in a protest of “a million people on the Mall in Washington.”¶ A big Senate victory would also give supporters a way to minimize future debate about the controversial portions of the bill. The House is expected to pass a series of smaller immigration bills but no path to citizenship, which is the heart of the Senate effort. If a House Republican takes issue with a particular element of Senate reform, a supporter will claim the issue was already debated and resolved in the Senate. Charges of bigotry are always just below the surface in the immigration debate. If the perception is that the Senate has already worked through the tough issues, then House skepticism will be easier to frame as being motivated by bigotry instead of policy concerns. The charges won't be coming just from liberals. The Wall Street Journal’s conservative editorial page has conveyed that sentiment already about those who oppose reform. Since a number of Republicans worry about how the party is perceived by voters as it debates this issue in public, fear of looking intolerant will be pronounced, putting even more pressure on lawmakers in the House to ratify the Senate version. ¶ Those who oppose comprehensive immigration reform have already lost in the Senate. Their best chance to defeat the bill is to make the Senate process the enemy. “I cannot support an amendment cobbled together at the eleventh hour that doubles the border patrol without knowing how much it will cost or whether it is even the right strategy, said Sen. John Cornyn, a Republican from Texas. This opposition seeks to jujitsu the successful Senate vote, turning it into an argument against the legislation.

#### Pass both houses – momentum ensures vote count

Chaffee 6/14/13 (Joshua, “Bill Clinton on immigration: “55 or 60%”chance it will pass”, <http://tv.msnbc.com/2013/06/14/bill-clinton-on-immigration-55-or-60chance-it-will-pass/>)

Former President Bill Clinton is “bullish” that Congress will pass comprehensive immigration reform. Speaking to Alex Wagner on NOW Friday, Clinton expressed optimism about the legislation but suggested Speaker John Boehner would need to break the so-called Hastert rule to do it.¶ The former president believes there will be enough votes to pass an immigration reform bill, but asks, “Will [Speaker Boehner] allow a bill to be brought to the floor of the House that does not have the support of a majority of his own caucus, but clearly would get a big bipartisan majority in the House?”¶ So far, Boehner isn’t showing his cards. The Speaker said Tuesday there was “no question” that immigration reform would be passed in the House and Senate and signed by the end of this year. But he started walking that back on Thursday, saying “I don’t intend to bring an immigration bill to the floor that violates what I and what members of my party–what our principles are.”

#### Growing support – strong Senate pressure ensures House acceptance

Nakamura 6/11/13 (David, “Obama reenters immigration-reform arena as Senate begins debate on bipartisan bill”, http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2013-06-11/politics/39887343\_1\_immigration-overhaul-president-obama-senate-group)

Senate proponents of the legislation have said they hope to win up to 70 votes to pressure the GOP-controlled House to accept the major components of the bill. Advocates also said they were encouraged by Obama’s return to the issue after months of focusing on gun control, the budget and foreign policy.¶ In his speech, the president highlighted a broad swath of support for the bill, appearing with AFL-CIO President Richard Trumka, U.S. Chamber of Commerce President Thomas Donohue, former George W. Bush administration commerce secretary Carlos Gutierrez, business executive Steve Case, San Antonio Mayor Julian Castro (D) and others.

#### Will pass – atmosphere of bipartisanship ensures momentum and compromise

Sunday Dispatch 6/15/13 (“Hope of progress on immigration bill”, <http://psdispatch.com/news/otheropinion/600551/Hope-of-progress-on-immigration-bill>)

After years of rancorous debate and at least one election in which Hispanics flexed their political muscle, an immigration reform bill is moving forward in the U.S. Senate. On Tuesday, the Senate voted overwhelmingly, 84-15, to begin final debate on the “Gang of Eight” — four Democrats and four Republicans — immigration bill.¶ The compromise is really about two issues: border security and a path to citizenship. Republicans demanded the former, Democrats the latter. The fate of immigration reform will ultimately depend on the willingness of each side to find the right compromise.¶ That’s why Senate Republicans and Democrats have consistently crossed party lines to vote down amendments that would tip the balance too far one way or the other.

#### Senate vote count

UPI 6/16 (The Issue: Immigration reform bill finally hits Senate floor, http://www.upi.com/Top\_News/US/2013/06/16/The-Issue-Immigration-reform-bill-finally-hits-Senate-floor/UPI-74111371375000/#ixzz2WOPekgUk)

Debate finally began on the U.S. Senate floor last week on the bipartisan immigration reform bill seen as the best opportunity in a while -- or for a while -- to overhaul the nation's immigration laws.¶ Senate supporters still must fend off opponents' "poison pill" amendments designed to nothing more than scuttle the Border Security, Economic Opportunity and Immigration Modernization Act. However, Senate leaders and vote-counters expressed confidence the bill would pass with 60 votes, and possibly 70, before the July 4 recess.

#### Growing bipartisan support – passes both houses

Nevarez 6/15 (Griselda, “Deferred action seen as turning point in fight for immigration reform”, http://www.voxxi.com/deferred-action-immigration-reform/#ixzz2WOQIpTNL)

In recent months, key Republican leaders in the Senate and House have stepped up to the plate to draft an immigration reform bill and other Republicans have endorsed the legislation. Democrats have also been key in drafting the bill and garnering support for it.¶ There’s also a growing list of individuals who up until recently, were unlikely supporters of immigration reform. The list includes Tea Party leaders, evangelicals and conservative lawmakers.¶ What’s more, support for immigration reform among the general public is perhaps the strongest it’s ever been. A poll released Thursday shows there is overwhelming bipartisan support for the immigration legislation proposed in the Senate by the “Gang of Eight.” In the 29 states polled, public support for the bill ranges from 61 percent to 78 percent.¶ “This is the best chance in a generation to enact immigration reform with a path to citizenship,” Sharry said during a call with reporters Thursday. “The American people strongly support the effort, it is in the best interest of both parties to deliver on the promise of reform, and our movement is getting stronger every day.”

#### Will pass but its tight

Cowan 6/7 [Richard, Columnist focused on Congressional policy, “Immigration Reform Backers Insist Bill Will Pass Within a Few Weeks”, Reuters, 6/7/13, <http://www.rawstory.com/rs/2013/06/07/immigration-reform-backers-insist-bill-will-pass-within-a-few-weeks/>, CMR]

The “Border Security, Economic Opportunity and Immigration Modernization Act,” a nearly 900-page reworking of the nation’s 27-year-old immigration law, faces a tough fight in the Democratic-held Senate and an even harder battle in the more conservative House of Representatives later this year.¶ At its core is a plan to move 11 million people residing in the United States illegally – many of whom came from Mexico years ago – out of their illegal status and onto a 13-year path to citizenship.¶ At the same time, the legislation would spend around $6 billion more to strengthen border security and would change the way temporary visas are issued, putting more emphasis on helping U.S. farmers and high-tech industries get foreign labor.¶ “It is gratifying to see the momentum behind this package of common-sense reforms, which will make our country safer and help 11 million undocumented immigrants get right with the law,” Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid said.¶ While he promised to give senators ample opportunity to change the bill – a few dozen amendments are expected – Reid also warned that he would not allow opponents to debate the measure endlessly. Work on the bill will be wrapped up before the July 4 recess, Reid, a Nevada Democrat, said.¶ The bill’s handling of the 11 million undocumented residents is particularly problematic for many Senate Republicans who see it as rewarding people who broke the law by entering the United States illegally while others waited in foreign lands for their applications to be processed.¶ “We can’t reject a dutiful, good person to America and then turn around and allow someone else who came in illegally to benefit from breaking our laws to the disadvantage of the good person,” said Republican Senator Jeff Sessions of Alabama.¶ Sessions, who has been a leading voice against the legislation, added: “It will definitely give amnesty today” to the 11 million.¶ Sessions and other senators are expected to push for greater border security efforts and are also likely to try to eliminate the pathway to citizenship for the 11 million.¶ Nevertheless, backers of the bill were confident that it will pass within a few weeks, putting the onus on the Republican-controlled House to tackle the immigration overhaul, a top issue to Hispanic voters who mainly backed Obama in last year’s election.¶ Republican Senator John McCain, a member of the “Gang of Eight” that wrote the legislation, said he remains optimistic that there are at least 60 votes in the 100-member chamber to pass the bill, the number needed to clear any procedural roadblock.¶ “We’ve got over 60 votes. I’m confident of that,” McCain told Reuters.¶ He said he believed that by the time the amendment process ends, backers will have 70 votes on passage, the number supporters are aiming for to put pressure on the House to act.¶ “There are some real concerns about border security that we have to work through, but I’m confident that we will be able to do so,” McCain said.

#### More warrants and reasons it will pass -

**First, Graham**

**Wasson 6/16**

[Eric, political staff writer, “Graham predicts 'breakthrough' passage of immigration bill with over '70 votes'” The Hill, 6/16/13, <http://thehill.com/blogs/blog-briefing-room/news/305827-graham-predicts-breakthrough-passage-of-immigration-bill-with-over-70-votes#ixzz2WR4g4fib>]

Sen. Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.) on Sunday **predicted overwhelming congressional passage** of an immigration reform bill.¶ “I think we are going to have a political breakthrough, that Congress is going to pass immigration reform,” Graham said on NBC's Meet the Press.¶ He said the Senate will give the reform bill — which currently has a path to citizenship for the nation's 11 million illegal immigrants — **overwhelming support**.¶ “I think we are going to get **plus 70 votes**,” he said. “I've never been more optimistic about it.”¶ Graham said passing the bill is a political necessity for the GOP.¶ “If we don't pass immigration reform, if we don't get it off the table in a reasonable, practical way, it doesn't matter who we run in 2016,” he said. “**We're in a demographic death spiral** as a party.¶ The only way we can get back in the good graces of the Hispanic community, in my view is pass comprehensive immigration reform.”

**second, rubio—will swing votes**

**Mali 6/16**

[Meghashyam, Hill politics editor, “Sen. Rubio Says Most of Immigration Reform Bill in ‘Perfect Shape’” The Hill, 6/16/13, <http://thehill.com/video/senate/305825-sen-rubio-says-most-of-immigration-reform-bill-in-perfect-shape#ixzz2WRJM77JP>]

Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.) on Sunday said that much of the Gang of Eight’s immigration reform bill was in “**perfect shape**,” but added he would insist on tougher border security measures.¶ Rubio, one of the authors of the bill, was asked if he still supported it on ABC’s “This Week.”¶ ¶ “I think it's an excellent starting point, and I think 95, 96 percent of the bill is in perfect shape and ready to go. But there are elements that need to be improved. **This is how the legislative process is supposed to work,” said Rubio**.¶ The Tea Party favorite, **seen as critical to winning conservative support** for the measure, has called for more stringent border security requirements.¶ On Sunday Rubio declined to say if he would vote against the bill without those added provisions.¶ “I don't really want to get involved in these hypotheticals and ultimatums,” he said.¶ **Rubio said he was optimistic** that senators could craft a border deal.

**Err neg—their evidence is biased**

**Salter 6/14**

[Mark, former chief of staff (McCain), “Amid Immigration Reform Cacophony, Passage Looms,” Real Clear Politics, 6/14/13, <http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2013/06/14/amid_immigration_reform_cacophony_passage_looms_118816.html#ixzz2WR8FIYDP>]

Losing sight of the forest for the trees is a paradox of the 24/7 news cycle, which often pays equal attention to important and insignificant political developments, and important and insignificant players. The kind of granular and excited press scrutiny applied to the debate on immigration reform legislation, for example, where it seems almost anything uttered on the subject by almost anyone can get a quick headline in Politico, makes it harder to judge the bill’s prospects.¶ Who whispered what to whom in the cloakroom or which senator’s offhand comment as he stepped into an elevator signaled progress, or which senator’s peevishness in a caucus meeting pointed to trouble for the bill aren’t likely to tell us anything other than the obvious.¶ ¶ One hundred members of the Senate are presently engaged in debating a sweeping and complex measure on an issue of considerable political importance to both parties. They have different views on the subject and various motives for their actions, and they will all have something to say about it before the debate is over. But, as with any institution, some of its members will have a greater say over the ultimate fate of the legislation than will others.¶ So, who matters and who doesn’t? Well, for starters, **you can put most members of both parties in the “they don’t really matter very much**” category. That’s a bit of an exaggeration and not entirely fair. They all have a vote, and anyone who votes in the majority will have played a small but limited role in the bill’s success or failure.¶ So, let’s refine the category to those members of Congress whose minds on the subject are firmly made up, who won’t change their position no matter how much the bill is amended during the debate, but who won’t take a leadership position in efforts to support or defeat it. At it happens, that category includes most members in both parties.¶ They’ll make statements during the debate to explain their position and try to inoculate themselves from whatever political risks they’re taking, if any. Supporters will insist they don’t back amnesty and opponents will insist they aren’t anti-immigrant. (For the purposes of this debate, that mostly translates into saying they aren’t anti-Hispanic; some of their best friends are Hispanic, and, in a couple of cases, even their parents.) But you could write the platitudes for them and what they say and do won’t affect the bill’s prospects one way or another.¶ **Ted Cruz belongs in this category**. He won’t support the bill no matter how it is amended. And **he won’t play much of a role in convincing others** to oppose it because those members who value his opinion on the matter have already made their minds up to oppose it as well.¶ Given the amount of press attention he’s received since arriving in the Senate, it seems obvious that Cruz sees this issue as he sees every other major issue -- as an opportunity to preen about how he’s standing up for his principles against the sell-out Republican squishes in Washington. Never mind that his principles aren’t always as inviolate as he likes to make them out to be, and they rarely include the principle of discharging the responsibility to govern that he asked the voters of Texas to grant him. The only thing that seems to matter to Mr. Cruz Goes to Washington is what his country can do for him.¶ Rand Paul might matter -- if he is, as he insists is the case, genuinely interested in shaping a comprehensive bill he can support. He could influence other libertarian-leaning Republicans. But he’s not serious if he continues to demand an amendment that effectively sunsets the bill pending a future Congress’ judgment about whether the border security provisions worked as advertised.¶ Future Congresses aren’t bound by the actions of past Congresses. If five or 10 years from now Congress decides the bill didn’t achieve its objectives, it can pass new legislation. But it ought to do it by regular order, facing the same difficulties and political risks this Congress faces as it tries to pass this one.¶ The Gang of Eight matters. Any member who’s working to address the concerns of colleagues who are persuadable for or against the bill matters. Persuadable members matter.¶ Who else matters? John Boehner, who recently suggested to ABC’s George Stephanopoulos that he will allow the House to vote on immigration reform even if a majority of Republican members haven’t agreed support it. If the House speaker means that, **it’s probably the only real news on the immigration debate** this week. Because -- and here’s a fact that really matters -- **majorities in both chambers already support** comprehensive immigration reform, and it will probably have a filibuster-proof majority in the Senate.¶ To the feigned horror of Ted Cruz, the **leadership of both parties wants it to pass** (although some Republican leaders aren’t always eager to publicly admit it). The GOP’s most recent vice presidential nominee wants it to pass, as do most Republican leaders who care about the GOP’s future as a national party. Which means, no matter how many “Perils of Pauline” stories you read in the press, **immigration reform is probably going to be enacted. And that’s the forest** lurking behind the trees of Washington’s indiscriminate hyperbole.

**Bipartisanship**

**Stuart 6/11**

[Elle, Research Assistant, Foreign Policy Fellows Program at New America Foundation, “Immigration Reform: Bipartisanship's Improbable Poster Child,” New America Foundation, 6/11/13, <http://inthetank.newamerica.net/blog/2013/06/immigration-reform-bipartisanships-improbable-poster-child>]

You could forgive Tamar Jacoby and Simon Rosenberg if they had a cynic’s déjà vu. The two advocates have traveled down the comprehensive immigration path before. They were there in 2006 and 2007, when a few brave souls tried to pass a bipartisan grand deal on immigration and failed. So why is it that both Jacoby and Rosenberg, the Republican and Democratic representatives for New America’s conversation on immigration reform, are cautiously optimistic about the hopes for immigration reform in 2013? **Is the need to “get something done” good enough to get something done?**¶ First, the process has had its own rewards. Rosenberg, president and founder of the center-left think tank NDN, opened up the discussion by asserting that the so-called “Gang of Eight” discussions have really worked, **forging a durable bipartisan core** that has **fended off efforts** to derail a deal. He said that the “compromises in the bill were understandable. Democrats didn’t accept things that they didn’t get anything in return for. **Everybody got something, everybody gave something**.” Jacoby, President and CEO of ImmigrationWorks USA, agreed, saying that “a year ago, if you said Republicans would be full partners in comprehensive immigration reform, people would have laughed. What’s astonishing is that once you have the will, people still know how to negotiate.” Both panelists reiterated their optimism about the bipartisan nature of negotiations in the Senate, while expressing a shared hope that the grittier details of the negotiations would not derail a desire to “get something done” that seems to be pervading both parties. **Republicans recognize they lost the Latino vote badly in 2012; Democrats know they need to keep a promise made to immigration advocates**.

**laundry list—overcomes aff warrants**

**Barro 6/11**

[Josh, current politics editor at Business Insider, Former Senior Fellow at the Manhattan Institute for Policy Research, “It’s Over: Comprehensive Immigration Reform Is Going To Pass”, 6/11/13, http://www.businessinsider.com/its-over-comprehensive-immigration-reform-is-going-to-pass-2013-6]

This Congress only acts when it absolutely has to. We got a resolution to the fiscal cliff and a debt ceiling increase because those were necessary. We won't get tax reform or a sequestration replacement because those are optional.¶ This week, we learned that **Republicans really do view passing comprehensive immigration reform as an imperative**. I'm ready to call this: **It's going to pass.**¶ There have been two big developments. One is that House Speaker John Boehner won't rule out passing a bill that lacks majority support from the Republican caucus — likely the only way a bill with a path to citizenship can pass the House.¶ The other is that Sen. Kelly Ayotte (R-N.H.) announced her support for the comprehensive Senate bill. Crucially, the Huffington Post reports that Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.), a member of the pro-reform Gang of Eight, was actually urging Ayotte to delay announcing her support.¶ This is weird, but there's a reason. Rubio and other pro-reform conservatives want changes to the bill. Roughly, these are the proposals that Sen. John Cornyn (R-Tex.) is going to put forward in an amendment to spend more on border security and delay the normalization of status for unauthorized immigrants until border agents are apprehending at least 90 percent of people trying to cross the border illegally.¶ Democrats view this as a poison pill that will delay legalization indefinitely, and they really don't want it in the bill. To get it, Rubio and Cornyn have to convince them that the only way to get enough Republican votes for passage is to include such a provision. They need people like Ayotte to hold out. But the forces within the GOP that favor immigration reform are **too strong for that to happen**.¶ Establishment Republican forces in Washington **desperately want comprehensive reform** with a path to citizenship and an increase in legal immigration. Business interests view reform as something that will grow the economy and create opportunities for investment; they may also hope that it will push wages down.¶ Republican operatives believe that passing immigration reform is a necessary step to improve the party's standing with the growing Hispanic demographic.¶ Not only do these constituencies really want a bill, **they don't care about border security** and so they don't even view the Cornyn Amendment as a bonus. Rubio and Cornyn's meddling with the bill is all downside.¶ A comprehensive bill **will pass the Senate** with the votes of enough Republicans to get past 60 votes. When it gets to the House, Boehner will be in an uncomfortable position: **There will be enough votes for passage**, but most of his caucus will vote against it, and some will be angry that he brought it up.¶ But that would be true even if the Senate bill were amended to Rubio and Cornyn's liking. Most House Republicans won't vote for any bill with a path to citizenship. And there is a key difference between not wanting to vote for a comprehensive immigration reform bill and not wanting one to pass.¶ For many, many House Republicans, the ideal situation is for a reform bill to pass over their objections. Business interests will get the bill they want, Democrats will be deprived of a powerful talking point with Hispanic voters, and individual house members will be able to tell conservative primary voters that they tried to "stop amnesty." Win, win, win.¶ This is why **Boehner isn't as "embattled**" as you often hear. He's a useful punching bag for the conservatives in his own caucus, who know that Republicans must agree to various things that conservative primary voters hate. That's the role he's preparing to play again on immigration.

**Boehner**

**Lee 6/11**

[Esther Yu-Hsi, Immigration Reporter at Center for American Progress, “Boehner Believes That Immigration Bill Will Pass By End of The Year,” Think Progress, 6/11/13, <http://thinkprogress.org/immigration/2013/06/11/2133891/boehner-immigration-bill-pass-end-of-year/>]

House Speaker John Boehner (R-OH) said that the Senate immigration bill **has a likely chance** of being signed into law by President Obama by the end of the year, during an interview on ABC News with George Stephanopoulos that aired on Tuesday. Boehner gave his support for immigration reform, but **did not rule out** bringing a bill to the floor that does not have the support of a majority of the House Republican caucus. He did indicate that the Senate bill does not go far enough to secure the border and deferred to the House when asked about his position for the inclusion of a path to citizenship.

#### Immigration reform will pass – strong, bipartisan passage in the Senate will clear the way for House passage

Benen 5/22/13 (Steven, “Immigration reform advances with bipartisan backing”, <http://maddowblog.msnbc.com/_news/2013/05/22/18418751-immigration-reform-advances-with-bipartisan-backing?lite>, CMR)

The question isn't whether comprehensive immigration reform will pass the Senate; the question is when and by what margin.¶ A sweeping bill to overhaul the nation's immigration system cleared its first major hurdle late Tuesday night, with the 18-member committee charged with completing a first round of legislative edits voting to advance the amended bill to the full Senate.¶ The vote in the Senate Judiciary Committee was 13-5.¶ Three Republicans - Sens. Jeff Flake of Arizona, Lindsey Graham of South Carolina and Orrin Hatch of Utah -- joined the panel's 10 Democrats to vote in favor of the bill.¶ The floor debate will begin shortly after Memorial Day, and Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) told reporters yesterday the Republican leadership will not use procedural tactics to try to block the legislation. It raises the possibility of an extraordinarily rare sight: major legislation receiving an up-or-down vote on the Senate floor without a GOP filibuster.¶ That said, yesterday's success was not easy, and it came at a cost. Most notably, Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman Pat Leahy (D-Vt.) pushed for an amendment to allow U.S. citizens to apply for permanent resident status on behalf of their same-sex partners. Republicans threatened to kill the entire reform package if Democrats approved Leahy's measure, and while Democrats supported the amendment, they weren't willing to derail the entire bill over this provision. Left with no good options, Leahy grudgingly pulled his amendment, rather than force his Democratic colleagues to vote against the measure they liked.¶ It was a reminder that the bipartisan reform bill, despite its strengths, is "imperfect."¶ So, what happens now?¶ The "Gang of Eight" bill is expected to remain intact and appears to be on track for passage. Whether there's a Republican filibuster or not, the votes are in place, and "Gang of Eight" members continue to lobby their on-the-fence colleagues in the hopes of creating an even larger majority.¶ Why bother if the bill already has the votes needed to pass? Because proponents want to send a signal to the House by running up the score -- it's one thing for the lower chamber to look askance at a partisan bill that ekes out a narrow victory in the Senate; it's something else for the House to kill a bipartisan Senate bill that passes with 70 or more votes.¶ And at this point, that's apparently the goal. The legislation reportedly enjoys the unanimous support of the Democratic caucus (55 votes), plus the Republicans on the "Gang of Eight" (4 more votes), plus the likely support of some GOP moderates (Collins + Kirk = 2 more votes), and proponents believe as many as 10 other Republicans, including Hatch and Cornyn, are in play.¶ The goal is to put as much pressure as possible on the House, and at this point, the plan is coming together nicely.

#### Momentum ensures compromise deal that passes both houses

Ferrechio 5/27/13 (Susan, Chief Congressional Correspondent, “House, Senate nearing showdown over immigration reform”, <http://washingtonexaminer.com/house-senate-nearing-showdown-over-immigration-reform/article/2530506?custom_click=rss>, CMR)

Congress may be on the verge of striking a long-awaited deal on immigration reform when it returns to work after the Memorial Day recess, but lawmakers caution that a final compromise is far from assured.¶ Democratic Senate leaders pledge to take up a bipartisan compromise authored by the Gang of Eight senators in June. But a separate bipartisan group is crafting a House version of the bill that House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi, D-Calif., said could be merged with the Senate version before Congress' summer recess in August.¶ "We are optimistic about the prospects," Pelosi said.¶ House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, said he is "confident that we'll have a solid work product that we can go to conference with the Senate."¶ House lawmakers working on their own immigration bill were buoyed last week when the Senate Judiciary Committee backed the Senate plan by a wide margin. The Senate bill couples new border security measures with a path to citizenship and instant legalization for illegal immigrants who came to the U.S. before 2012.¶ After the Senate panel cleared the measure, Minority Leader Mitch McConnell, R-Ky., announced he would not block efforts to bring the bill to the Senate floor.¶ "I think the Gang of Eight has made a substantial contribution to moving the issue forward," McConnell said. "And so I'm hopeful we'll be able to get a bill that can pass here in the Senate."¶ The Senate committee's approval also provided "wonderful momentum" for House negotiators, said Rep. Luis Gutierrez, D-Ill., who is helping write the House immigration bill.

#### Reconciliation ensures compromises that resolve existing issues – passes both houses by August

Sweet 5/27/13 (Lynn, “Lynn Sweet: Immigration-reform deal could pass by August: Pelosi”, <http://www.suntimes.com/news/sweet/20378242-452/lynn-sweet-immigration-reform-deal-could-pass-by-august-nancy-pelosi-says.html>, CMR)

WASHINGTON — House Democratic Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.), who hits Chicago this week along with President Barack Obama for fund-raising events to benefit Illinois House Democrats, told me Monday that there is enough “general agreement” on bipartisan immigration reform for a measure to pass — and she laid out an aggressive timetable, saying a bill could be sent to Obama to sign by August.¶ Pelosi also underscored in our interview that she wants the House to have its own bipartisan immigration bill. The Senate bipartisan measure is already out of committee and set to hit the Senate floor in June. If people in Washington thought otherwise — that she wanted to wait on the Senate (and I have read some stories with that suggestion) — they are wrong.¶ “We can be working simultaneously,” she told me in the phone interview, speaking from San Francisco, where she marked Memorial Day.¶ While the House bipartisan immigration proposals will likely end up being more conservative than the legislation already advanced in the Democratic-controlled Senate, Pelosi wants a House bill for a practical reason: To get to 218 votes in the GOP-run House — and assuming massive Democratic support — there has to be something in the immigration bill to get the support of about 30 Republicans.¶ That’s also the pragmatic position of Rep. Luis Gutierrez (D-Ill.), one of eight members of the House bipartisan task force. Gutierrez “has really been our champion,” Pelosi said. “He has been a real force.”¶ Pelosi lands in Chicago on Tuesday for two days of fund-raising and, time permitting, the Rolling Stones concert Tuesday night at the United Center.¶ On Tuesday, Pelosi will be the keynoter at a “Women for Brad” reception at the Hilton Northbrook for freshman Rep. Brad Schneider (D-Ill.), who is heading toward a 10th District rematch in 2014 with former Rep. Bob Dold, a Republican. The chief co-hosts are the four Democratic women in the Illinois delegation: Reps. Jan Schakowsky, Tammy Duckworth, Cheri Bustos and Robin Kelly.¶ On Wednesday morning, Pelosi will team up with Schakowsky and Kelly at Loyola University for a forum with Women Employed, the Women’s Business Development Center and other related groups to discuss creating more jobs for women.¶ Obama flies here Wednesday for two major fund-raising events to help the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, the House political operation. The tab ranges from $1,000 for a ticket to $50,000 for those who can “bundle” donations from their own social, professional or political contacts.¶ The main event is at the Chicago Hilton, 720 S. Michigan. Major donors are invited to a dinner hosted by BettyLu and Paul Saltzman. BettyLu Saltzman holds an important place in Obama’s political history: She was one of the first major fund-raisers and Democratic activists who saw in him — when he was starting his political career in Chicago — a future president.¶ For the 2014 cycle, Obama so far has agreed to headline eight events for the DCCC — two of them to be held jointly with the Democratic Senate political shop.¶ Chicago will be the third stop on that commitment; Obama has appeared at DCCC events in San Francisco and New York this year.¶ House Democrats had a great year in Illinois in 2012: The 18-member delegation has 12 Democrats and six Republicans. The National Republican Congressional Committee has targeted four Illinois Democrats elected last year for defeat in 2014: Reps. Schneider, Bill Foster, William Enyart and Cheri Bustos.¶ Pelosi and the DCCC are defending those seats — and have targeted GOP Illinois freshman Rep. Rodney Davis for defeat, raising money for former Madison County Judge Ann Callis.¶ “Money raised in Illinois,” Pelosi said, “stays in Illinois.”¶ As for immigration, Pelosi is optimistic that obstacles that may loom large now can be bridged — after the House and Senate pass their own bills and the two chambers come together to reconcile the different versions.¶ In predicting August passage, Pelosi said support “may be not by everybody, but by enough.”

#### Immigration reform will pass – spirit of bipartisanship resolves remaining obstacles

Dallas News 5/24/13 (“Editorial: Bipartisan progress on immigration reform”, <http://www.dallasnews.com/opinion/editorials/20130524-editorial-bipartisan-progress-on-immigration-reform.ece>, CMR)

Immigration reform is making its way slowly, deliberately, sometimes painfully — almost surprisingly civilly — through the U.S. Senate. Last week, the Senate Judiciary Committee passed Senate Bill 744 on a 13-5 bipartisan vote. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid said he will bring it to a vote of the full Senate in June.¶ It could be the most sweeping immigration reform in two decades. Just as significant as what it does for immigration is what it might do for governance, bipartisanship and civility on Capitol Hill. The bill, drafted by a “Gang of Eight” that included four Republicans and four Democrats, was shepherded by fully half the gang — Republican Sens. Lindsey Graham of South Carolina and Jeff Flake of Arizona and Democratic Sens. Chuck Schumer of New York and Dick Durbin of Illinois.¶ For five days and through 300 proposed amendments (fully 200 of which were actually debated), the four fended off efforts, intentional and unintentional, to submarine the bill. Not even the committee chairman, Democratic Sen. Patrick Leahy of Vermont, was immune. He wanted to include a provision that would have allowed same-sex couples to have the same immigration rights as heterosexual couples. Seeing it as a deal-breaker, Democrats joined Republicans in defeating the amendment.¶ Similarly, poison pill amendments by Texas’ own Ted Cruz were voted down on a bipartisan basis. One of the GOP senator’s amendments would have stripped the path to citizenship; another could have banned U.S. citizens from receiving welfare benefits if they’d ever entered the country illegally.¶ Overall, we applaud the Senate’s bipartisan efforts — a refreshing example of collaboration over conflagration. This newspaper is disappointed, though, that once again Texas’ senators weren’t part of those efforts. Cruz and Sen. John Cornyn cast two of just five votes against the immigration bill. By distancing themselves from the bipartisan compromise, they show a lack of leadership on an issue of vital importance to our state.¶ The day after the Judiciary Committee pushed the Senate bill forward, the House Committee on the Judiciary held its own immigration hearing. With no bill before it the hearing — titled “S. 744 and the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986: Lessons Learned or Mistakes Repeated?” — did more to amplify conflicts than resolve differences. The House seems to know what it doesn’t like (Senate Bill 744) but hasn’t a clue about what it does (an as-yet-undetermined House bill).¶ We urge both chambers to get on with the business of crafting bipartisan immigration reform. The country and our state desperately need a fix for the dysfunction that passes as our current immigration system.

#### Will pass – but bipartisan consensus is fragile

Pittsburgh Post-Gazette 5/27/13 (“On the move: Immigration reform gets a bipartisan boost at last”, <http://www.post-gazette.com/stories/opinion/editorials/on-the-move-immigration-reform-gets-a-bipartisan-boost-at-last-689264/>, CMR)

Just when Congress was giving the impression that the best it could do was investigate administration scandals, the Senate Judiciary Committee voted 13-5 Tuesday to advance a bipartisan bill on immigration reform, the first real action in a generation.¶ No issue has been more contentious. To his credit, former President George W. Bush proposed legislation that made humanitarian and economic sense, only to see it shot down by xenophobic figures in his own Republican Party. It took the re-election of President Barack Obama with the help of aroused Hispanic voters to bring more sage counsel that makes a deal possible.¶ The problem remains as it was -- more than 11 million immigrants in the country illegally. The need too is the same, only a little more urgent -- to regularize these shadow dwellers so that they can live normal lives, pay taxes and generally contribute to American society. And the solution too hasn't changed -- a path to legal status that does not reward illegal behavior and at the same time beefs up border security.¶ After five days and 301 amendments offered, the Border Security, Economic Opportunity and Immigration Modernization Act (S 744) does pretty much meet this challenge, although, as with many products of the political sausage machine, its parts will not be to the taste of everybody.¶ It would apply to those who arrived in the United States before Dec. 31, 2011; have maintained continuous physical presence here; and have remained out of serious trouble with law enforcement. After paying a $500 fine, those immigrants would be granted provisional immigrant status lasting six years, renewable for another $500.¶ It would take a decade for such an immigrant to become eligible for a green card if he or she met other conditions, including being up to date on taxes. The immigrant would also have to pay a $1,000 fine and wait another three years to apply for citizenship.¶ While cries of "Amnesty!" may not be stilled, this is decidedly lowercase amnesty. The legislation has sections laying out a "Comprehensive Southern Border Security Strategy" with more border patrol guards and the use of state National Guard troops if needed.¶ One of the last obstacles was agreement on a compromise allowing more visas for highly skilled foreign workers, which would benefit high-tech firms in places such as Pittsburgh. But the whole package almost unraveled when Sen. Patrick Leahy, D-Vermont, sought to give same-sex spouses the same rights as heterosexual couples under immigration law -- but backed down after pressure from Republicans and Democrats.¶ This was a final reminder that the consensus is fragile. The bill's fate in the full Senate is uncertain, and then there's the fractious Republican-led House. But at least immigration reform is moving again. If it does not pass, that will be its own scandal.

### Will Pass – Momentum

#### Grassroots campaigns will target Republicans with growing Latino populations; many have indicated that they are willing to turn

Kaplan 7/7/13 (Rebecca, “Advocates of Senate Bill Turn Their Attention to the House”, The National Journal, July 7, 2013, l/n)

When House members left for the July Fourth recess, the prospects for an immigration overhaul in the lower chamber were slim. When members return this week, they will be greeted by the full attention of a coalition of advocates who helped push the Senate bill to completion and who are now turning their sights to the House.¶ The coming campaign will include efforts to mobilize grassroots actions through town-hall meetings and voter registration drives aimed at Latinos, television and radio ads, and lobbying from representatives of crop growers, high-tech employers, religious leaders, and more. ¶ Several advocacy groups say between 20 and 40 Republican members are ripe targets for aye votes, particularly those whose districts have a growing Hispanic population. The National Council of La Raza is zeroing in on 20 to 26 members, many of whom represent districts where 20 percent or more of voters are Hispanic. Frank Sharry, the executive director of the pro-reform group America's Voice, estimated that 35 Republicans are "vulnerable to demographic shifts." At the end of June, Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee Chairman Steve Israel, D-N.Y., circulated a list of 23 "persuadable Republicans," including 12 in districts in which more than 10 percent of the voting-age population is Hispanic. The districts, all of which President Obama won with at least 46 percent of the vote in 2012, are in California, Colorado, Florida, Illinois, Minnesota, New Jersey, New Mexico, Nevada, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania.¶ "I think the idea is to pressure the House Republicans right, left, and center, and to do everything we can to bring outside pressure on them to get them to give us a vote on immigration reform with a path to citizenship," Sharry said. "I actually think the House guys, they've sort of retreated a bit into their comfort zone, and I'm quite optimistic that our movement and our allies across the political spectrum will jolt them out."¶ Some members will be hit multiple times. Republican Reps. Buck McKeon of California, Mike Coffman of Colorado, Dan Webster of Florida, and Michael Grimm of New York are all targeted by both the DCCC and the Center for Community Change, which last week launched a $1 million campaign consisting of paid media, field activities, and lobbying visits to pressure the House to pass an immigration bill before lawmakers leave for the monthlong August recess.¶ "Those are all members that we think are winnable, and we've seen some progress in their statements and had meetings where we believe that they will pay attention to the changing demographics in their district and are amenable to a bill," said Jeff Parcher, communications director at the Center for Community Change.¶ In addition, the group is targeting the House Republican leadership, House Oversight and Government Reform Committee Chairman Rep. Darrell Issa, R-Calif., and Rep. Greg Walden, R-Ore., who runs the National Republican Campaign Committee.¶ Several House members also stand to end up in the cross-hairs of high-tech advocates, who will lobby the House after successfully enlisting the help of Utah Republican Sen. Orrin Hatch to get some of their top priorities included in the Senate immigration bill.¶ "Our goal is to make sure that every House member understands that skilled immigration matters to each and every one of them in some way, shape, or form," said Robert Hoffman, senior vice president for government affairs at the Information Technology Industry Council.¶ His group which met with almost every senator's office to lobby for the immigration bill in the upper chamber is still developing its list of top targets. A report by the Bay Area Council Economic Institute shows that several Republicans represent areas with a big percentage of high-tech jobs. Republican Rep. Mo Brooks of Alabama represents parts of Huntsville, where 22.4 percent of jobs were in high-tech in 2011. Rep. Mike Pompeo, R-Kan., represents parts of Wichita and its 14.8 percent of high-tech jobs. Reps. Bill Posey of Florida, Duncan Hunter of California, Jason Chaffetz of Utah, and Doug Lamborn of Colorado all represent districts that included cities with more than 10 percent of jobs in the industry.¶ The broad coalition of groups backing the Senate immigration bill also includes religious leaders, notably the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops and the Southern Baptist Convention. Kevin Appleby, director of migration policy and public affairs for the USCCB, said his group would focus in particular on organizing parishes and arranging meetings with Catholic representatives who would be receptive to the bishops' message. Thirty-one percent of House members are Catholic, according to the Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life; 61 of those are Republicans.¶ "You're never going to persuade some, but in terms of all the advocacy, they haven't felt the maximum pressure yet," Appleby said.¶ While the broad coalition around the Senate bill comprised of business, labor, agriculture, high-tech, faith leaders, Hispanic community advocates, and otehrs coalesced around the Senate bill in recent months, they won't necessarily all be pressuring the House to take up that bill (Sen. Chuck Schumer, D-N.Y., a leader of the Gang of Eight, predicted on Fox News recently that the House will do so). Most advocates will insist on a comprehensive bill with a pathway to citizenship, but they realize the House is a different animal, and they think pushing the House and Senate to get to a conference committee is a more realistic goal.¶ "The most effective thing we can advocate for is a process that results in both the House and Senate sitting down," Hoffman said. "We all have to do our part to get the House ready to support as comprehensive an approach as possible."¶ Some advocates are waiting to finalize their lobbying strategy until after a House GOP meeting scheduled for July 10, when the members will have their first conference-wide discussion of immigration.¶ "We're anxious to see how that begins to play out in the House, and we're eager to play a role that's best suited for us in making reform a reality," said Dan Conston, a spokesman for the American Action Network, a conservative, pro-reform group that recently launched a $50,000 ad buy on Fox News in Florida to urge support for Sen. Marco Rubio, R-Fla., a member of the Gang of Eight.¶ Nearly all the coalition members are working on mobilizing grassroots support for their cause. The National Council of La Raza, for example, is planning a "saturation" of Spanish-language media and voter-registration drives to motivate the Hispanic community.¶ As for opponents of the Senate bill, they already feel like they've scored a major victory by getting House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, to pledge he wouldn't bring a bill to the floor either before or after conference without majority support from his Republican members.¶ "I feel pretty confident that we can keep opposition somewhere between 80 and 95 percent," said Roy Beck, president of NumbersUSA, which seeks to limit immigration levels. Beck said his group, which has been working to build support in the House all year, will also try to win the allegiance of Democrats who are concerned that an increase in legal immigration levels will hurt American wages.

### Will Pass – GOP Support

#### Many lawmakers caught between growing Hispanic constituencies and threats of conservative primary candidates; several are vunerable and need to support immigration reform

￼￼ MSNBC 7/8/13 (GOP wrestles with immigration reform consequences — tv.msnbc.com/2013/07/08/gop-wrestles-with-immigration-reform-consequences/ 1/3)

Some Republican lawmakers are increasingly facing a tough choice–support a comprehensive immigration bill and face a backlash from their constituents or oppose efforts to provide a path to citizenship for undocumented workers and contribute to larger GOP losses in the future.¶ Republican strategists are already fretting about the long-term implications for the party if they reject a comprehensive immigration bill, but that’s a bitter pill for conservative activists to swallow, who are promising primary challenges and substantial blowback if lawmakers back reform.¶ This week begins a new focus on immigration’s future in the House, and center right groups are launching a new push this week. American Action Network is going up Monday with a $100,000-plus national TV ad campaign, aimed to convince House Republicans to support the Senate’s immigration reform bill by trumpeting the border surge in the legislation as the “toughest border security plan ever passed by Congress.” The ad will run during primetime on Fox News and brings the group’s total investment on air backing reform to $750,000.¶ On Wednesday, House Speaker John Boehner will meet with House Republicans for a special conference meeting on immigration, to try to sort out a legislative path that a majority of lawmakers can support.¶ The same day, former President George W. Bush will preside over a naturalization ceremony and argue for immigration overhaul.¶ But with fewer and fewer competitive House districts and Senate lawmakers who voted for the reform bill passed last week already facing threats of primary challenges, conservative activists are threatening to kill the effort, and it’s one reason GOP leadership and Boehner has been hesitant to even bring up the Senate bill for a vote.¶ Practically speaking, immigration’s failure or success will likely have little bearing on the partisan outcome of the 2014 midterms. Lawmakers’ individual primary re-election concerns, mostly in the House, is what’s driving much of the resistance to a bipartisan immigration bill that would provide a path to citizenship for 11 million immigrants who arrived here illegally.¶ But Republican leaders, who began pushing for reform after they lost the White House in 2012, know the bill’s demise could be a greater omen for 2016, when the GOP faces a growing Hispanic electorate that’s sure to be even more important in the next presidential election.¶ One national GOP strategist called the current debate “a mild short-term headache for which the party can take two Advil,” and noted it wasn’t as contentious as 2006, when another attempt at reform fell flat. Back then, a bill passed the Senate – when 23 GOP senators voted for it, compared to 14 last week–but the bill died in an even less-conservative House controlled by Democrats.¶ Without a majority of the caucus behind the bill the Senate passed last week with a 68-32 vote, Boehner has said he won’t bring the bill to the floor. Many Republicans remain optimistic that the bill has a path forward, whether in conference committee or through a new bill from a bipartisan working group in the House.¶ But with the conservative base now abuzz in opposition to an immigration bill they say is akin to amnesty–despite the 10 years it would take to get a green card, and another three-year waiting period before immigrants can apply for citizenship–lawmakers in safe districts could especially feel the pull in 2014–and that’s fueling much of their skepticism.¶ “These people aren’t controlled. They’re doing their own thing,” said another national Republican consultant of House members already up in arms against the bill. “Primary challenges come from conservative districts, and they don’t care if they upset leadership because there’s no consequences.”¶ Midterms vs. 2016¶ Party leaders know immigration is a problem they must come up with a solution to before demographics move even further away from them in the coming decade. In their post-2012 autopsy, the Republican National Committee wrote that the GOP “must embrace and champion comprehensive immigration reform” to reach out to the Hispanic community, and “if we do not, our Party’s appeal will continue to shrink to its core constituencies only.”¶ Potential 2016 hopefuls have had to do a delicate dance, too. Former House firebrand Allen West has threatened a primary challenge against Florida Sen. Marco Rubio who helped shepherd reform through the Senate. Another possible candidate, Kentucky Sen. Rand Paul, voted against the measure, saying it wasn’t tough enough on border security though he’s indicated in the past he could support a pathway to citizenship.¶ Further alienating Hispanic voters could have a bigger impact in a presidential year for the GOP though. In 2012, Latinos made up 10% of the electorate–and voted 71% for Obama, according to national exit polls. That’s an uptick from 2008, when 9% of the national electorate was Hispanic, and voted 67% for Obama.¶ In 2010, a GOP midterm wave year though, the numbers were better for Republicans. Latino voters made up just 8% of the electorate, and 60% of those said they supported Democrats. But with the economy and health care dominating the conversation, just 8% of all voters said illegal immigration was the most important issue.¶ Democrats see it as another issue where they can point to a dysfunctional Republican Congress, hoping that positioning themselves as the party of compromise can help their brand even as they face fewer competitive House seats.¶ Last week, the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee sent a memo to its caucus pointing out 23 “persuadable” GOP lawmakers who represent significant Hispanic populations and would be “out-of-step with major groups in their districts if House Republicans fail to deliver a solution.”¶ Many of those are in competitive or potentially competitive House seats, including California Republicans Gary Miller, David Valadao, and Jeff Denham. Miller, arguably the most vulnerable GOP incumbent, sits in the most Democratic seat held by a Republican, and only won re-election with help from an election fluke after no Democrat advanced past the state’s new top-two primary. Other vulnerable incumbents, including Colorado Rep. Mike Coffman, New York Rep. Michael Grimm, and Nevada Rep. Joe Heck, are also targeted.¶ A coalition of immigrant and labor groups are also targeting House leadership with radio ads and on social media, hoping to push the House to a vote.¶ But Democrats aren’t just looking for a solution–they’re looking for ammunition, too. This week the DCCC also launched RepublicansInTheirOwnWords.com, inviting submissions for outlandish GOP statements “so members of the public can peruse House Republicans’ positions on immigration in their own words.”¶ These races likely won’t be won or lost on immigration alone, with the economy, health care, and a variety of other important issues coming into play–and there’s no guarantee even Latino voters will base their vote solely on an immigration vote, but to Democrats it plays into a greater message of a worsening GOP brand.

### Will Pass – AT: Border Security

#### Senate immigration bill effectively answers the concerns about illegal immigration

￼￼

KELLER 7/7/13(BILL, “Liberals vs. Immigration Reform” The New York Times, July 7, 2013 http://www.nytimes.com/2013/07/08/opinion/keller-liberals-vs-immigration-reform.html?pagewanted=all&\_r=1&)

¶ As a flaming liberal ... and strong supporter of immigration and its reforms, I would have voted against the bill [the Senate] just passed.¶ ¶ This bill stinks: it takes far too long to grant citizenship and does little or nothing to protect American jobs ... The Dems always get rolled.¶ ¶ With its costly sop to xenophobes in the form of useless border control overkill, this bill is already a joke.¶ ¶ [There will be] a huge political backlash once it becomes obvious to Americans that a broad swath of our citizenry is being sold out in favor of vote-hungry politicians, corporations eager to cut labor costs even further and military contractors trolling for still more pork.¶ ¶ I never thought I’d see the day when I’d be grateful for the knee-jerk opposition of Republicans in the House, but that day has arrived ... It’s a slap in the face of the American working class and the millions of unemployed Americans...¶ ¶ The Democrats lost my vote w/this. They no longer represent anyone but billionaires and Big Business.¶ ¶ And so on.¶ ¶ If the immigration bill that passed the Senate on June 27 dies the death of previous reforms, it will not be because of the angry Democrats quoted above. It will be the familiar obstructionism of House Republicans, and particularly Speaker John Boehner, who may refuse to let the measure even come to a vote. That is why the news coverage has focused on the hostility of Republicans.¶ ¶ But if you scroll down from The Times’s news article to the 522 reader comments, you will find plenty of unhappy Democrats as well — not on Capitol Hill, but Out There. The howls of betrayal sampled above reflect the main complaints from those on the left: The bill, they worry, will steal jobs from American workers by admitting new streams of both low-skilled and high-skilled competitors. It wastes more than $40 billion to militarize the Southern border. It makes the 11 million unauthorized immigrants already here wait 13 years for full equality. And, by the way, how can any self-respecting liberal be for something that enjoys the support of Grover Norquist, the Koch brothers, the Chamber of Commerce and the Fox News commentariat?¶ ¶ There is a strong conservative case for the elaborate contraption called the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act of 2013. And no, it is not just about neutralizing the hostility of Latino voters. For the conservative brief, I refer you to David Brooks (here and here) or Douglas Holtz-Eakin (here).¶ ¶ My aim here is to address some of the liberal misgivings. Like virtually every milestone in the history of Congress, the Senate bill choreographed by the tireless liberal legislator from New York, Charles Schumer, is a package of compromises, enticements, marketing (see the title), electoral calculation, micromanaging and kitchen sinks (such as SEC. 4503. ENCOURAGING CANADIAN TOURISM TO THE UNITED STATES). The question that troubles liberals is, did Schumer give away too much in the quest for Republican votes? After slogging and scrolling through the 1,198 pages of devilish details, I think the answer is no.¶ ¶ Specifically, the aims of comprehensive reform are three: to impose some regulatory order on a legal immigration system that is dysfunctional and illogical; to assert greater control over our borders, for reasons of economics and security; and to deal humanely with the 11 million who came here outside the legal channels. Despite imperfections, the Senate bill accomplishes all three.¶ ¶ OVERHAULING LEGAL IMMIGRATION The Senate bill replaces a system that was based mainly on family reunification, country-by-country quotas and something resembling indentured servitude to one based mainly on the job market. Reuniting nuclear families — spouses and minor children — is still a priority, and is actually increased and accelerated. But beyond that, the bill adopts an approach that has proved successful in Canada and other developed countries, favoring immigrants who bring skills the country needs to replenish our aging work force and build new businesses.¶ ¶ When the new law is fully implemented, the best guess is that it will increase the number of new green cards issued every year from about 1 million to at least 1.5 million, probably more, mostly for specific categories of workers.¶ ¶ This issue — admitting new workers — is a perennial conundrum. How do you balance the need for fresh energy against the interests of those already here? But the battle is being waged this time in a context that makes liberals especially uneasy. For one thing, we are contemplating an extraordinary opening of our country at a time when 22 million Americans are unemployed or underemployed. For another, the balance of power in Washington has shifted against the working class. In past battles over immigration, American workers counted on organized labor to defend against an influx of cheap foreign workers. But in the past 30 years labor has lost much of its clout. And some unions have recalculated their interests: now they see new legal immigrants (and legalization of those already here illegally) not so much as a threat to their incumbent members but as potential recruits, a way of reversing union decline. Meanwhile business, which has always tended to favor more open borders, has gained influence the old-fashioned way, with campaign money and a legion of lobbyists. And the tech industries, which have mobilized especially aggressively on this issue, have the added cachet of being the cool kids at the party.¶ ¶ So, yes, the bill contains major concessions to businesses that claim they have trouble filling some jobs even at a decent wage. The bill would create new channels of permanent immigration and temporary visas for low-skilled labor, especially in agriculture, and for more highly skilled workers in technical fields.¶ ¶ But the bill makes employers jump through a lot of hoops to take advantage of this new labor pool. To hire a foreign temporary worker you have to pay a $2,500 fee, offer the worker the prevailing wage and (at the low-skilled end) show that you’ve tried to fill the job domestically. In many cases, that foreign worker will end up costing you more than an American citizen.¶ ¶ And, as Ana Avendaño, who handles immigration issues for the A.F.L.-C.I.O., points out, the bill introduces new safeguards against worker exploitation. Workers here on temporary visas are no longer captives of their sponsoring employer; they can change jobs. Workers cannot be deported for blowing the whistle on an abusive or unsafe workplace. There are new protections against human trafficking. The labor federation, with some misgivings, supports the bill.¶ ¶ The bill is especially — perhaps overly — generous to employers at the high end. Any foreigner who gets a graduate degree from an American university in science, technology, engineering or mathematics (STEM in the vernacular) and has a job offer can apply for a green card — even if he or she studied for a field that is already crowded with native job applicants. The bill would award permanent residence to anyone with a Ph.D. in any subject from any university in the world, if he or she has a job offer in that field. (“We want the smartest people here,” Schumer explains.) As the demographer Michael Teitelbaum points out, you can find shortages of skilled labor at some times, in some fields, and in some places, but over all there is plenty of domestic STEM talent looking for work. Teitelbaum suggests the bill would be improved by establishing an independent and authoritative panel, like the one in Britain that advises the government on adjusting the annual visa limits in different skilled specialties based on credible evidence about these labor markets. Schumer’s people say what works in Britain would be too cumbersome in a job market of 150 million workers. “By the time you gather the data, it’s old,” said Schumer’s immigration guru, Leon Fresco.¶ ¶ The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office estimates that over the first decade the bill will have a negative but minuscule effect on employment and average wages. And then the influx of new workers will improve growth, create jobs and reduce the deficit. Other studies, from the Center for American Progress on the left to the Cato Institute on the libertarian right, have also concluded that the long-term economic effect is positive and substantial. All of these estimates are more than a little speculative, depending on human behavior and government enforcement. But most experts agree that the country will ultimately benefit, as it has in the past, from being the preferred destination of the ambitious, the industrious, the brave, the new.¶ ¶ And as the bill supplies new streams of legal labor, it attempts to restrict the flow of illegal labor. As Doris Meissner of the pro-reform Migration Policy Institute notes, “It replaces a laissez-faire illegal system with a regulated legal system.” Which brings us to ...¶ ¶ CONTROLLING THE BORDERS The $46.3 billion earmarked to double the size of the border patrol, raise fences and install monitoring technology on our Southern flank is a nice stimulus package for border states and a windfall for a few favored technology companies, but it is mostly for show. Forty-percent of those here illegally didn’t jump a fence; they simply overstayed a student or tourist visa.¶ ¶ By far the most promising control measure in the bill is one business hates, one that has been overshadowed by the border fortification boondoggle: mandatory employer verification. Employers will now be held accountable for verifying that anyone they hire has a legal right to work here. It replaces the current voluntary system, which is almost universally ignored, with real penalties and real enforcement. Foreign workers will be required to have a tamper-proof ID, including a photo and a fingerprint. Citizens can use a driver’s license or a voter ID. The bill also launches a project to design a fraud-proof Social Security card. Some inventive employers will find loopholes. But there are plenty of teeth in those 1,198 pages.¶ ¶ THE 11 MILLION For most liberals I suspect this is the heart of the bill — and not just because Democrats crave the approval of the country’s surging Latino constituency. (Although, come to think of it, isn’t responding to the electorate what democracies are supposed to do?) The status quo is an undocumented underclass of families living in fear, subject to exploitation and scapegoating, depressing wages by working off the books, denied any say in how they are governed. Unless you think it is realistic to forcibly deport a population the size of New York City plus Chicago (and 21 percent of Americans subscribe to that heartless notion, according to the latest Pew poll), you have to let them out of the shadows.¶ ¶ Most of the debate focuses on the path to citizenship — 13 years for adults, a shorter time for those brought here as children. Citizenship is important, and 13 years is a long time to wait. That is the concession advocates of full equality made in fairness to others who played by the rules, and as a disincentive to future illegal immigrants.¶ ¶ But while they are on that long path, they are legal residents of America. Soon after the bill becomes law, undocumented workers who have not been convicted of a serious crime can apply for legal status as “registered provisional immigrants” — not voters, and not eligible for welfare or food stamps or insurance subsidies under Obamacare, but free to work, study, travel (including out of the country) without the fear of being snatched from their families and deported.¶ ¶ To me, and I think most residents of the undocumented netherworld, the long path to citizenship is a fair price to pay for the short path out of hiding.

### Will Pass – AT: Citizenship/House

#### Their authors overstate opposition – it can pass without House extremists

Bernstein 5/27 (Jonathon, “The basic math of immigration reform in the House”, 2013, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/plum-line/wp/2013/05/27/the-basic-math-of-immigration-reform-in-the-house/>, CMR)

Be careful of immigration bill analyses that give heavy weight to the strongest opponents of what they call “amnesty.”¶ A Reuters story that got a fair amount of attention this past weekend does just that. Prospects for an immigration bill passing the House are indeed hard to report on, but the key here isn’t what House extremists want. Their votes aren’t in play anyway.¶ Look at the math. As Reuters notes, Republicans currently have a 233-201 edge in the House.¶ Can Republicans pass any immigration bill without Democratic support? That would be the case if they attempt to pass a slimmed-down bill without any path to citizenship. Republicans have been claiming they can do that, but I still think it’s unlikely. Such a bill would probably get very few Democratic votes — perhaps none at all. Meanwhile, if the bill were generous at all toward immigrants it would almost certainly lose those Republican members who oppose immigration reform of any kind; if it was harsh toward immigrants it would presumably lose moderates and those conservatives who believe that support for immigration is the proper conservative position. Either way, it’s hard to see them getting to 218 with only Republicans.¶ On the other hand, legislation with a path to citizenship would have support from the bulk of the Democrats and need only a relatively small group of Republicans to join them. Judging from the Senate — where three of the eight Republicans on the Judiciary Committee already voted for a comprehensive bill — finding 20 or 30 Republicans to vote yes shouldn’t be too hard.

#### Citizenship is only a matter of logistics now – not insurmountable

Johnson 5/30

[Fawn, Immigration correspondent for the National Journal, “Will Obama Immigration Plan Make History?” National Journal, 5/30/13, <http://www.nationaljournal.com/thenextamerica/immigration/will-obama-immigration-plan-make-history-20130128>]

There are three main hurdles to passing an immigration bill—citizenship, guest-workers, and House Republicans. Any one of them could scuttle the prospects of passage, but all are surmountable.¶ Citizenship. A bizarre shift occurred in the last year when Rubio emerged onto the national scene and begged fellow conservatives to speak more positively about immigration. The sparring that used to be about “amnesty,” or legalizing illegal immigrants, is now about granting them citizenship. Rubio and former House Speaker Newt Gingrich are among the conservatives who have protested any law that gives illegal immigrants their own method of becoming citizens.¶ That’s fine, say White House officials and congressional Democrats. They aren’t asking for a special path to citizenship. They just want it to be possible for non-criminal undocumented immigrants to live legally in the United States and use regular methods to become citizens within a reasonable amount of time. “Reasonable” is subject to negotiation—10 years? 20 years? No one disputes that the illegal immigrants need to be “at the back of the line.” The negotiation is basically a matter of logistics unless Republicans refuse to allow any way for illegal immigrants to become citizens. Then it’s over.

### AT: UQ Overwhelms

#### CIR will pass now but it’s on the brink

New York Times 7/8 (The editorial board, “Immigration in the House,” <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/07/08/opinion/immigration-in-the-house.html>, ME)

The Republican caucus of the United States House of Representatives is holding a private meeting on Wednesday. The subject will be immigration. Perhaps it will be a showdown or a summit that will reset the party’s direction on this issue. Maybe party leaders and moderates will push back against Tea Party no-dealers and hard-core members, like Steve King of Iowa, who want to kill any bill that allows undocumented immigrants to become Americans. Maybe Republicans will decide to accept bipartisan immigration reform as a step toward becoming a party with something to offer Latino and Asian voters besides hostility and fear.¶ Or maybe not. Now that the Senate has passed its version of reform — a comprehensive bill with a long but real citizenship path — the ball is in the House. It might be stuck there: the speaker, John Boehner, has ruled out voting on the Senate bill, or on any immigration bill not supported by the majority of his caucus. That is a recipe for failure, but the House has nothing else to offer right now, no other solutions to match the scale of the problem.¶ Four immigration bills have passed the House Judiciary Committee, each with its own nonanswers. The SAFE Act doubles down on the failed strategy of trying to force millions of immigrants to self-deport. It would free states to write their own immigration laws, give state and local law enforcement more power to make immigration arrests, and remove the discretion for the Homeland Security Department to defer the deportations of harmless immigrants in favor of all-out, indiscriminate enforcement. The Ag Act would make it easier to exploit cheap temporary workers, who would be deported when their jobs were done. The Legal Workforce Act would vastly expand the use of federal electronic databases to screen job applicants, an invitation to discrimination. And the Skills Visa Act would create an immigration path for thousands of entrepreneurs and workers in science, technology, engineering and math fields — a worthwhile goal but a very narrow one.¶ A bipartisan gang of House members has been working on a broader bill, but nobody has seen it yet and it may go nowhere because it is said to include a path to citizenship. About all that can be safely predicted is that we are in for a summer of heat and pressure, with immigrant advocates loudly demanding a bill and defiant Republicans digging in to make sure that reform collapses.¶ If only enough House Republicans could see that the bill is one that embraces many of their own priorities. It shrinks the deficit and satisfies big-business interests with more visas for agricultural and information-technology workers. It ushers millions of shadow workers into the higher-earning, taxpaying, aboveground economy, a sure recipe for jobs and growth. And it heaps billions on defense contractors to supply the surveillance tools and weaponry to fortify the border.¶ The coalition behind comprehensive reform is large. It includes evangelicals and Catholics, law-enforcement and business groups, and Republicans like Jeb Bush and former President George W. Bush. Immigrant-rights advocates and Democrats are solidly lined up, too, even those who want a shorter path to citizenship and less money thrown at the border buildup.¶ Mr. Boehner has a choice. He can let reform go forward with bipartisan support — House Republicans and Democrats together could pass a good bill. This would infuriate the hotheads in his caucus but save the Republican Party from itself. Or he can stand back and let his party kill reform. As the issue festers, a nation is watching to see whether the Republicans can work out their Steve King problem and do something difficult for their own good, and the country’s.

## Links - General

### Link – Generic – Partisanship

#### Unique link – major shifts in policy towards Latin America cause partisan battles

Whitehead & Nolte 12 (Laurence Whitehead, senior research fellow in politics at Nuffield College, Oxford, and Detlef Nolte, acting president of the GIGA, director of the GIGA Institute of Latin American Studies, professor of political science at the University of Hamburg, Number 6, 2012, <http://www.giga-hamburg.de/dl/download.php?d=/content/publikationen/pdf/gf_international_1206.pdf>, CMR)

US–Latin America relations are routinely managed by multiple bureaucratic agencies, which can act quite autonomously and are often not coordinated via a common ¶ strategy. Obama’s Latin America policy has frequently been hampered by political ¶ polarization and partisan divisions in Congress. „ The intermestic dimension of US–Latin American relations has complicated foreign ¶ policy, because a more self-confident and autonomous majority in Latin America ¶ has sometimes sought a policy shift with regard to highly sensitive topics, such as ¶ drugs, immigration and Cuba.¶ „ One issue area where some would criticize the Obama administration is its slowness ¶ in improving relations with Brazil or placing Brazil on par with, for example, India.¶ „ It is unlikely that Latin America’s modest ranking in US foreign policy will increase ¶ or that Washington’s priorities will shift much after the November 2012 elections.

#### Plan ensures partisan fights

Roett 10 – director of the Latin American Studies program at the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies (Riordian, “What Do the U.S. Election Results Mean for Latin America?”, 11/8, <http://www.thedialogue.org/page.cfm?pageID=32&pubID=2505>, CMR)

A: Riordan Roett, director of the Latin American Studies program at the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies: "While the president's re-election is welcome in general terms, it is difficult to imagine Latin America will receive greater attention in the next four years. Congress remains deeply divided. The administration's foreign policy priorities will continue to focus on China, the Middle East and the ongoing fiscal challenges. Given the strong turnout by the Latino community, one area that should receive priority is continued immigration reform, but it is the third rail for the Republican majority in the House. In general, the democratic governments of the region will welcome the president's election without great expectation for major policy initiatives. The populist regimes will continue to denounce any democratically elected administration. The deadlock over Cuba will continue unless there is a dramatic leadership shift to a new generation. The major policy initiative that would be welcome in the region is on drug policy, but that issue will remain taboo."

### Link – Generic – Unconditionally

#### Open engagement is dead-on-arrival – guarantees huge fights

Cohen 13 (Roger, Columnist with NYT for over 20 years, “Diplomacy Is Dead”, Jan 21, <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/01/22/opinion/global/roger-cohen-diplomacy-is-dead.html?_r=1&>, CMR)

DIPLOMACY is dead.¶ Effective diplomacy — the kind that produced Nixon’s breakthrough with China, an end to the Cold War on American terms, or the Dayton peace accord in Bosnia — requires patience, persistence, empathy, discretion, boldness and a willingness to talk to the enemy.¶ This is an age of impatience, changeableness, palaver, small-mindedness and an unwillingness to talk to bad guys. Human rights are in fashion, a good thing of course, but the space for realist statesmanship of the kind that produced the Bosnian peace in 1995 has diminished. The late Richard Holbrooke’s realpolitik was not for the squeamish.¶ There are other reasons for diplomacy’s demise. The United States has lost its dominant position without any other nation rising to take its place. The result is nobody’s world. It is a place where America acts as a cautious boss, alternately encouraging others to take the lead and worrying about loss of authority. Syria has been an unedifying lesson in the course of crisis when diplomacy is dead. Algeria shows how the dead pile up when talking is dismissed as a waste of time.¶ Violence, of the kind diplomacy once resolved, has shifted. As William Luers, a former ambassador to Venezuela and the director of The Iran Project, said in an e-mail, it occurs “less between states and more dealing with terrorists.” One result is that “the military and the C.I.A. have been in the driver’s seat in dealing with governments throughout the Middle East and in state to state (Pakistan, Afghanistan, Iraq) relations.” The role of professional diplomats is squeezed.¶ Indeed the very word “diplomacy” has become unfashionable on Capitol Hill, where its wimpy associations — trade-offs, compromise, pliancy, concessions and the like — are shunned by representatives who these days prefer beating the post-9/11 drums of confrontation, toughness and inflexibility: All of which may sound good but often get you nowhere (or into long, intractable wars) at great cost.¶ Stephen Heintz, president of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, wrote in an e-mail that, “When domestic politics devolve into polarization and paralysis the impact on diplomatic possibility becomes inordinately constraining.” He cited Cuba and Iran as examples of this; I would add Israel-Palestine. These critical foreign policy issues are viewed less as diplomatic challenges than potential sources of domestic political capital.¶ So when I asked myself what I hoped Barack Obama’s second term would inaugurate, my answer was a new era of diplomacy. It is not too late for the president to earn that Nobel Peace Prize.¶ Of course diplomats do many worthy things around the world, and even in the first term there were a couple of significant shifts — in Burma where patient U.S. diplomacy has produced an opening, and in the yo-yoing new Egypt where U.S. engagement with the Muslim Brotherhood was important and long overdue (and raised the question of when America would do the same with the Brotherhood’s offshoot, Hamas.)¶ But Obama has not had a big breakthrough. America’s diplomatic doldrums are approaching their 20th year.

### Link – Generic – Political Capital

#### Substantial changes in engagement drain political capital

Oppenheimer 5/9 – Latin- America correspondent for the Miami Herald (Andres, “Andres Oppenheimer: Boost ties with Latin America”, 2013, <http://www.fresnobee.com/2013/05/09/3293617/andres-oppenheimer-boost-ties.html#storylink=cpy>, CMR)

I've read with great attention President Barack Obama's article in The Miami Herald earlier this week on how to improve U.S. relations with Latin America. It was pretty disappointing.¶ The article, headlined "Improving our Partnership" and published after Obama's return from a trip to Mexico and Costa Rica, says that "this is a moment of great promise for our hemisphere" and is full of feel-good talk about the future of the Americas.¶ But, sadly, it showed the absence of any U.S. plans to drastically expand trade ties with Latin America -- like the Obama administration has done with Asia and Europe -- or any sign that, in his second term, Obama will pay greater attention to this hemisphere.¶ Before we get into what Obama should do, let's take a quick look at the facts. In his article, Obama stated that about 40% of U.S. exports are currently going to Latin America, and that these exports are growing at a faster pace than U.S. shipments to the rest of the world.¶ Obama also celebrated that the U.S. Congress is finally close to approving comprehensive immigration reform. While that's a U.S. domestic issue, it would have a positive economic impact on Mexico and Central America, since millions of newly legalized immigrants would be able to visit their native countries, and most likely would be sending more money to their families back home.¶ But here are some of the facts that Obama failed to mention in his article:¶ U.S. total trade with Latin America has actually fallen as a percentage of our total trade over the past decade. While 39% of the nation's overall trade was with the Western Hemisphere in 2000, that percentage fell to 38% in 2012, according to U.S. Department of Commerce data.¶ Despite Obama's May 23, 2008, campaign promise to launch "a new alliance of the Americas," he has not started any major hemispheric free-trade initiative. By comparison, every recent U.S. president had started -- or at least tried to start -- a hemisphere-wide trade deal.¶ Obama has launched the Trans-Pacific Partnership free trade talks with mostly Asian countries, and a similar Trans-Atlantic Partnership free-trade negotiation with the 27-member European Union, but has not announced any plans for a Trans-American Partnership.¶ Granted, he has helped ratify free trade deals with Colombia and Panama, which had been signed by his predecessor. And, sure, the Trans-Pacific Partnership plan includes a few Latin American countries, such as Mexico, Peru and Chile, but they are a minority within the proposed new bloc.¶ In his May 2 trip to Mexico, Obama failed to meet Mexico's request to be included in the U.S.-proposed Trans-Atlantic partnership free-trade talks with the European Union. The Mexican governments had asked that Mexico and Canada be included in the Trans-Atlantic Partnership plan so that the proposed deal could become a North American-European Union deal. But the White House response was not yet.¶ Despite Obama's 2011 announcement of a plan to increase to 100,000 the number of Latin -American students in U.S. colleges and to 100,000 the number of U.S. students in Latin-American universities -- his most ambitious initiative for the region -- progress on the project has been slow.¶ The plan calls for significant private-sector funding, but Obama has invested little time or political capital in it. Fund-raising has been left in charge of the State Department, whose boss -- Secretary of State John Kerry -- has shown scant interest in Latin America.¶ Kerry did not travel with Obama to Mexico and Costa Rica last week, and his April 18 remark at a congressional hearing about Latin America being "our backyard" had the rare effect of antagonizing friends and foes alike in the region.¶ My opinion: As regular readers of this column know well, I much prefer Obama over his Republican critics on most issues. But I find it unfortunate that, as Obama's recent trade initiatives with Asia and Europe show, he looks East and West, but very little toward the South. Neither he, nor Kerry, nor any Cabinet-level official is focused on the region.¶ Perhaps it's too late to expect any changes. But the least Obama could do is get personally involved in the projects he has already launched. For instance, he should pick up the phone and ask CEO's of top multinationals to chip in funds for his plan to raise student exchanges with Latin America to 100,000 in both directions. If Obama doesn't get personally involved, not even that will happen.

#### Significant changes require political capital – Obama’s first term proves

Whitehead & Nolte 12 (Laurence Whitehead, senior research fellow in politics at Nuffield College, Oxford, and Detlef Nolte, acting president of the GIGA, director of the GIGA Institute of Latin American Studies, professor of political science at the University of Hamburg, Number 6, 2012, <http://www.giga-hamburg.de/dl/download.php?d=/content/publikationen/pdf/gf_international_1206.pdf>, CMR)

A key example of this was the coup against ¶ President Zelaya in Honduras, when Obama sided within the Organization of American States ¶ (OAS) with the Latin American countries against ¶ the new Honduran government but some Republican senators had their own foreign policy agenda. The latter supported the new Honduran government and blocked the confirmation in the Senate of the US ambassador to Brazil and of the assistant secretary of state for the Western Hemisphere. In Foreign Affairs, Christopher Sabatini (2012) commentated sourly, “This absurdity – ¶ blocking for nine months the appointment of a regional assistant secretary of state and an ambassador to the region’s most important player (and the ¶ world’s seventh-largest economy) over a minor ¶ ideological spat regarding a tiny country – shows ¶ the lack of seriousness of the workings of the U.S.¶ Congress in general. But it also shows how unseriously Latin America is taken in particular and ¶ what sorts of issues are considered important.” ¶ This hijacking of Latin America policy by Republican senators obliged the administration to ¶ function with “carryover” appointments from its ¶ predecessor. Fortunately, the end of the previous¶ administration had seen a considerable improvement in the caliber of appointments, so the transition from Bush to Obama was less disruptive than ¶ it might have been. However, this also meant there ¶ was little scope for conspicuous innovation; or, as ¶ Leslie H. Gelb (2012) wrote: “Even with America’s ¶ own difficulties and other international priorities, ¶ the Southern Hemisphere has commanded shockingly little time from the White House. […] At the ¶ Cartagena summit 2012, Obama was slammed for ¶ his failure to roll up his sleeves on either the Cuban embargo or drugs. The most interest Americans showed in the region came when Secret Service officers were found to be cavorting with prostitutes.” ¶ The new focus of US policy toward the region ¶ was on promoting economic and social opportunity, ensuring citizen security, strengthening effective democratic institutions, and securing a cleanenergy future. Naim (2011) has criticized this ¶ agenda as being better suited to an economic development agency and not the State Department. ¶ It has allowed US diplomats to avoid tackling real ¶ and politically explosive issues. A little more political realism is necessary, because “development ¶ does not mean the end of politics” and because US ¶ policymakers need a reminder “that twenty firstcentury Latin America has its own, autonomous ¶ power dynamics” (Sabatini 2012).¶ Whether through lack of presidential attention or as a reflection of Obama’s own outlook, ¶ the result after four years is that positive results ¶ appear to be lacking. Washington has been “reactive” rather than “proactive” as issues have arisen. Problems certainly have arisen, of course: the ¶ drug war in Mexico escalated; Haiti’s fragile institutions were devastated by a huge natural disaster; the Honduran political class united to oust ¶ a constitutionally elected president; the Paraguayan president Lugo was deposed by an impeachment, and the new Paraguayan government was ¶ suspended from UNASUR and Mercosur. Washington’s responses can be characterized as improvised and lacking a sense of strategic direction.

#### Plan consumes Obama’s focus for domestic priorities

Whitehead & Nolte 12 (Laurence Whitehead, senior research fellow in politics at Nuffield College, Oxford, and Detlef Nolte, acting president of the GIGA, director of the GIGA Institute of Latin American Studies, professor of political science at the University of Hamburg, Number 6, 2012, <http://www.giga-hamburg.de/dl/download.php?d=/content/publikationen/pdf/gf_international_1206.pdf>, CMR)

Explanations for the Low-Key Latin America ¶ Policy¶ While the overall assessment of the administration’s Latin America policy could obviously be ¶ elaborated further, the broad pattern is rather ¶ clear. It may thus be more useful to consider how ¶ this low-key outcome can be explained. Since the ¶ results of the 6 November 2012 US election remain ¶ very much in doubt at the time of writing, there ¶ is limited scope for predicting how US relations ¶ with the Americas may unfold under the next administration. Even so, an understanding of the¶ factors that have constrained Obama’s team from ¶ fulfilling initial hopes in the first term should shed ¶ some light on future prospects as well.¶ Latin America has clearly ranked low in the ¶ administration’s policy priorities, and in all probability it will continue to do so for the next few ¶ years as well. Domestic and economic challenges are likely to outweigh most foreign policy concerns, and other parts of the world are likely to demand whatever attention the administration can ¶ spare for international affairs (except those with a ¶ very direct linkage to internal policy issues or domestic partisan divides). This is especially true as ¶ regards the focus of the White House. ¶

#### Latin America policy drains political capital – crowds-out other issues

Rozental 10 – member of the Advisor board, president of Rozental & Asociados in Mexico City and senior fellow at the Brookings Institution (Andres, “What Do the U.S. Election Results Mean for Latin America?”, 11/8, <http://www.thedialogue.org/page.cfm?pageID=32&pubID=2505>, CMR)

A: Andrés Rozental, member of the Advisor board, president of Rozental & Asociados in Mexico City and senior fellow at the Brookings Institution: "The results of the U.S. congressional elections can only be sobering news for Latin America in general, and Mexico in particular. With a political and foreign policy agenda in Washington already crowded with issues unrelated to our region, it would appear that the hemisphere will slip even further down on the list of priorities for both the Obama administration and Congress. The change of control in the House probably means that even if he really wanted to move the immigration and gun control agenda forward, President Barack Obama won't have the political capital needed to counter newly elected right-wing Republicans and Tea Party representatives who generally oppose comprehensive immigration reform or any limitations on Second Amendment rights to buy and own all types of weapons, many of which find their way to the drug cartels in Mexico and beyond. Although some analysts have forecast an increased foreign policy interest by the White House after the Nov. 2 elections, any such change will most probably focus on Afghanistan, India-Pakistan relations, Iran and the Middle East peace process, not on the immediate neighborhood. Congress has already reduced the amount of assistance under Plan Mérida to Mexico, Central America and the Caribbean, which was meant to materialize the 'shared responsibility' that the United States has rhetorically assumed for the war on drugs since Obama was elected two years ago. Nothing on his or the immediate congressional agenda would indicate today that relations with Latin America might substantially change during the remaining biennium of his first term."

### Link UQ

#### No major changes Obama’s second term

Whitefield 11/7/12 (Mimi, and Tim Johnson, “Will Latin America become a higher priority during second Obama term?”, <http://www.miamiherald.com/2012/11/07/v-fullstory/3086849/will-latin-america-become-a-higher.html>, CMR)

But, in general, regional expectations for meaningful change in U.S. Latin American and Caribbean policy during Obama’s second term were muted.¶ The campaigns of both Obama and Republican challenger Mitt Romney “proved that Latin America is not a priority for the United States,’’ said Simon Pachano, a political science professor at the Latin American Faculty for Social Sciences in Ecuador. “Latin America existed when they were looking for Hispanic votes, but it wasn’t present in their foreign policy proposals.”¶ Anthony Bryan, a senior fellow at the Institute of International Relations at the University of the West Indies, isn’t expecting “dramatic changes” either.¶ “President Obama will probably have more time to spend on foreign policy but I am not sure the Caribbean is high on the list of places that require attention,’’ he said.¶ There was an acknowledgment that Obama has big issues to deal with at home — job creation, tax code reforms, the deficit and bridging party divides — while hot-button international issues, such as an imploding Syria, troop withdrawal in Afghanistan, Iran’s potential nuclear weapons capability and the Chinese economy, will compete for attention .

#### Election politics prove – no major changes

Hakim 11/8/12 (Peter, member of the Advisor board and president emeritus of the Inter-American Dialogue, “What Will Obama's Second Term Mean for Latin America?”, <http://www.thedialogue.org/page.cfm?pageID=32&pubID=3135>, CMR)

Q: Barack Obama was re-elected president of the United States on Tuesday. What is his vision for foreign policy and how does Latin America fit into his plans? How will Latin American leaders and their citizens react to the election results? What role did Latinos in the United States play in the election and what does that mean for U.S. policy changes on issues such as immigration, drugs and Cuba? ¶ A: Peter Hakim, member of the Advisor board and president emeritus of the Inter-American Dialogue: "Any speculation about Obama's second term has to come mainly from his first-term performance. The campaign was about the candidates and their biographies—not about issues. Nothing suggests Congress will be more productive. The House remains virtually unchanged. The Senate will be more divisive still as most remaining moderate Republicans and Democrats resigned or lost their seats. We will know soon whether compromise is possible when the lame-duck Congress returns next week, and begins discussion of the fiscal cliff embroglio. The best guess is that Congress will find a way, not to resolve the problem, but to defer its consequences. The election results focused attention on immigration policy, which both Republicans and Democrats may be motivated to address. President Obama's declared intention to address immigration was surely reinforced by the huge Latino vote. Many of the Republicans who blocked previous immigration initiatives will resist again. But some recognize their party may become irrelevant unless they take seriously the Latino and black constituencies that accounted for more than 40 percent of Obama's total. U.S. immigration reform would be a welcome change in most of Latin America, particularly in Mexico, Central America and the Caribbean. Obama may seek to pursue further openings to Cuba—but these will be limited unless the Cuban government shows a willingness to reciprocate with new human rights measures or political changes. Drug policy is not high on the U.S. agenda, but the approval in Colorado and Washington of ballot initiatives to legalize marijuana use may spark wider discussion on drug issues. But Mitt Romney offered the most significant policy proposal for Latin America, when called for more intensive U.S. efforts to pursue multiplying economic opportunities in the region."

### AT: Link Turns

#### Link turns are hype – plan guarantees partisanship

Whitehead & Nolte 12 (Laurence Whitehead, senior research fellow in politics at Nuffield College, Oxford, and Detlef Nolte, acting president of the GIGA, director of the GIGA Institute of Latin American Studies, professor of political science at the University of Hamburg, Number 6, 2012, <http://www.giga-hamburg.de/dl/download.php?d=/content/publikationen/pdf/gf_international_1206.pdf>, CMR)

Modest Achievements, Lost Opportunities ¶ While acknowledging the domestic constraints ¶ on the administration, many observers and analysts still hold a critical view on US–Latin America policy during the Obama presidency. Indeed, ¶ some ask whether there has been a foreign policy ¶ for Latin America at all. A 2011 article in the Americas Quarterly by Moisés Naim is illustrative: “U.S. ¶ policy toward Latin America is lethargic, unimaginative and surprisingly irrelevant […] The fact ¶ that Latin America does not figure in the calculations or conversations of top U.S. decision makers does not preclude some of them from giving ¶ speeches about U.S. policy towards the region that ¶ are as disconnected from reality as those given by ¶ Fidel Castro in Cuba.” One contributing factor is ¶ that foreign policy and Latin America policy became the victims of partisan political polarization ¶ and ideology-driven foreign policy initiatives in ¶ Congress.

#### Zero link turns – lack of perceived benefits

Whitehead & Nolte 12 (Laurence Whitehead, senior research fellow in politics at Nuffield College, Oxford, and Detlef Nolte, acting president of the GIGA, director of the GIGA Institute of Latin American Studies, professor of political science at the University of Hamburg, Number 6, 2012, <http://www.giga-hamburg.de/dl/download.php?d=/content/publikationen/pdf/gf_international_1206.pdf>, CMR)

A fair assessment of President Obama’s Latin ¶ America record needs to recognize that the region ¶ is not central in US foreign policy. Candidates do ¶ not expect to win elections with topics related to ¶ Latin America, but they know they could lose elections with topics like illegal migration, drug trafficking, organized crime, or weakness in the face ¶ of anti-American stances. So while it is correct that ¶ there are many so-called intermestic topics linking the US with Latin America, most of these topics have a negative connotation. To make things ¶ even more complicated, in some of these areas ¶ Latin American countries are now demanding a ¶ policy shift on the part of the US government, as ¶ a report from the Inter-American Dialogue from ¶ April 2012 states: “The US position on these troublesome issues – immigration, drug policy, and ¶ Cuba – has set Washington against the consensus ¶ view of the hemisphere’s other 34 governments. ¶ These issues stand as obstacles to further cooperation in the Americas. The United States and the ¶ nations of Latin America and the Caribbean need ¶ to resolve them in order to build more productive partnerships.” For the moment it is quite difficult to foresee major progress with regard to any ¶ of these topics in the near future given the apparent distribution of US electoral preferences in the ¶ 6 November contest.

**Turns aren’t salient – plan is low priority, sparks fight and specifically drains PC necessary for immigration**

**Hakim et al, 12**

Peter Hakim, Andrés Rozental, Rubens Barbosa, Riordan Roett, Ruben Olmos

Inter-American Dialogue’s Latin America Advisor, Peter Hakim is president emeritus and senior fellow of the Inter-American Dialogue, a Washington-based think tank on Western Hemisphere affairs. He served as president of the Dialogue from 1993 to 2010, writes and speaks widely on hemispheric issues, and has testified more than a dozen times before Congress. His articles have appeared in Foreign Affairs, Foreign Policy, The New York Times, The Washington Post, Miami Herald, Los Angeles Times, and Financial Times, and in newspapers and journals in Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Mexico, Peru, and other Latin American nations. He is a regular guest on CNN, BBC, CBS, CNN en Español and other prominent news stations around the world. He wrote a monthly column for the Christian Science Monitor for nearly ten years, and now serves as a board member of Foreign Affairs Latinoamerica and editorial advisor to Americaeconomia, where he also publishes a regular column11/8/12 http://www.thedialogue.org/page.cfm?pageID=32&pubID=3135

What Will Obama's Second Term Mean **for Latin America**? Q: Barack Obama was re-elected president of the United States on Tuesday. What is his vision for foreign policy and how does Latin America fit into his plans? How will Latin American leaders and their citizens react to the election results? **What** role did Latinos in the United States play in **the election** and what does that **mean for U.S. policy changes** on issues such as immigration, drugs and Cuba? A: Peter Hakim, member of the Advisor board and president emeritus of the Inter-American Dialogue: "Any speculation about Obama's second term has to come mainly from his first-term performance. The campaign was about the candidates and their biographies—not about issues. **Nothing suggests Congress will be** more **productive. The House remains** virtually **unchanged. The Senate will be more divisive** still as most remaining moderate Republicans and Democrats resigned or lost their seats. We will know soon whether compromise is possible when the lame-duck Congress returns next week, and begins discussion of the fiscal cliff embroglio. The best guess is that Congress will find a way, not to resolve the problem, but to defer its consequences. The election results focused attention on immigration policy, which both Republicans and Democrats may be motivated to address. President Obama's declared intention to address immigration was surely reinforced by the huge Latino vote. Many of the Republicans who blocked previous immigration initiatives will resist again. But some recognize their party may become irrelevant unless they take seriously the Latino and black constituencies that accounted for more than 40 percent of Obama's total. U.S. immigration reform would be a welcome change in most of Latin America, particularly in Mexico, Central America and the Caribbean. Obama may seek to pursue further openings to Cuba—but these will be limited unless the Cuban government shows a willingness to reciprocate with new human rights measures or political changes. Drug policy is not high on the U.S. agenda, but the approval in Colorado and Washington of ballot initiatives to legalize marijuana use may spark wider discussion on drug issues. But Mitt Romney offered the most significant policy proposal for Latin America, when called for more intensive U.S. efforts to pursue multiplying economic opportunities in the region." A: Andrés Rozental, member of the Advisor board, president of Rozental & Asociados in Mexico City and senior fellow at the Brookings Institution: "President Obama's re-election is a welcome development for Latin Americans in general, and Mexicans in particular. Although many of Obama's campaign promises in 2008 relevant to the region remain unrealized, there is a modicum of hope that as a leader in his second term, **with more political capital to spend, he can at least make a stronger effort to tackle comprehensive immigration reform** and trade issues critical to Latin American prosperity. **Although I don't foresee any major change in** the **U**nited **S**tates' foreign **policy toward the region, especially as long as Afghanistan, Iran and the Middle East remain priorities for Washington**, that may not necessarily be a bad thing. We often complain when Washington pays too much attention to us, and equally when there's less overt interest in the region, but I believe that Obama has mostly shown a much more mature attitude toward Latin America over the last four years than has traditionally been the case. This will hopefully also be the case as his administration continues through 2016. Presumably, there will continue to be a strong focus on completing ongoing trade negotiations, especially the Trans-Pacific Partnership, to open new opportunities for economic growth and hopefully a re-visiting of NAFTA as a key option to make North America more competitive on the global scene. Latinos played a key role in re-electing Obama, just as they did in 2008, and the one message that Republicans have to take home at this stage is that the anti-immigrant, exclusionary policies voiced during the campaign by Mitt Romney, the Tea Party and other conservatives were a key factor in their ultimate defeat. Many of Obama's liberal views on minority rights and tolerance turned out to be much more popular among Americans as a whole than the opposing Republican positions on those same issues." A: Rubens Barbosa, former ambassador of Brazil to the United States: "In his second term, Obama will be more interested in looking for his legacy in history. The U.S. government will tend to be more proactive and try to increase its influence in the current hot spots: Pakistan, Syria, Iran and elsewhere in the Middle East. The relationship with China will continue to be high on the foreign policy agenda. Having in mind this scenario, **Latin America will continue to be off the radar of U.S. decision makers: the region will remain a low priority for Washington.** Despite this fact, the reaction of the Latin American leaders and citizens to Obama's re-election has been very positive. The role of Latinos in the election was important and in some places crucial. **In terms of policy changes** on issues such as immigration, drugs and Cuba, **Obama will continue to face strong opposition from the Republican Party** but I would not be surprised if new ideas could be advanced by the administration especially in relation to immigration and Cuba." A: Riordan Roett, director of the Latin American Studies program at the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies: "While the president's re-election is welcome in general terms**, it is difficult to imagine Latin America will receive greater attention** in the next four years. **Congress remains deeply divided**. The administration's foreign policy priorities will continue to focus on China, the Middle East and the ongoing fiscal challenges. Given the strong turnout by the Latino community, **one area that should receive priority is** continued **immigration reform**, but it is the third rail for the Republican majority in the House. In general, the democratic governments of the region will welcome the president's election without great expectation for major policy initiatives. The populist regimes will continue to denounce any democratically elected administration. The deadlock over Cuba will continue unless there is a dramatic leadership shift to a new generation. The **major policy initiative** that would be welcome **in the region** is on drug policy, but that issue **will remain taboo**."

**No turns – not high enough priority – even for supporters**

**Cardenas and Noriega, 12**

Roger F. Noriega, José R. Cárdenas, American Enterprise Institute, 12/5/12

Roger F. Noriega (rnoriega@aei.org) was a senior US State Department official from 2001 to 2005. He is currently a visiting fellow at AEI and managing director of Vision Americas LLC, which represents foreign and domestic clients. José R. Cárdenas (jrc@visionamericas.com) is a contributor to AEI’s Venezuela-Iran Project and a director with Vision Americas, http://www.aei.org/outlook/foreign-and-defense-policy/regional/latin-america/an-action-plan-for-us-policy-in-the-americas/

As US policymakers struggle to overcome sluggish economic growth while confronting abiding security threats, there is a stronger argument than ever for fortifying US partnerships with countries in the Americas whose economies and security are intertwined with America’s own economy and security. While **the U**nited **States has been preoccupied with other region**s, most Latin American nations have continued to modernize their market economies; two nations in particular—Brazil and Mexico—are emerging as global players. Therefore, the time is right to restore a strong bipartisan consensus in the United States that promotes a constructive, free-market growth agenda in the Americas. Practical initiatives—not rhetoric—will encourage America and its neighbors to find common ground for their collective benefit. Key points in this Outlook: America’s economic crisis and threats to US security have undermined its traditional global-leadership role and weakened its connections to Latin American nations that continue to modernize their economies. The United States must recover its regional credibility by taking bold initiatives to restore its fiscal solvency, while aggressively promoting trade, energy interdependence, technology transfer, and economic growth. The United States must then retool its strategy for its partners in the Americas by working with them to combat threats such as cross-border criminality and radical populism, encouraging dialogue with regional leaders, and ensuring law enforcement cooperation to develop a mutually beneficial relationship. A stable and prosperous Americas is indispensable to US economic success and security. **The region** is home to three of the top four foreign sources of energy to the United States, as well as the fastest-growing destinations for US exports and investment. Clearly, geography and shared values predetermine a united destiny for the United States and its neighbors in the Americas. How positive and fruitful that destiny will be **depends on whether US policymakers**, private **businesses,** and civil society **move with a greater sense of purpose toward seizing** promising **opportunities** and meeting critical challenges. Times have changed. The US **fiscal crisis and** preoccupation with two distant **wars have distracted policymakers in Washington** and undermined US leadership in the Americas. Although access to the US market, investment, technology, and other economic benefits are highly valued by most countries in the Western Hemisphere, today, the United States is no longer the only major partner to choose from. Asia (principally China) and Europe are making important inroads. So, as **US policymakers** retool their strategy for the Americas, they **must** shelve the paternalism of the past and **be much more energetic in forming meaningful partnerships** with willing neighbors. Of course, the United States must recover its credibility by **making bold decisions** to restore its own fiscal solvency, while **aggressively promoting trade, energy interdependence, technology transfer, and economic growth**. Then, Washington will be better positioned to cultivate greater economic and political cooperation among its neighbors, beginning with an open and candid dialogue with the region’s leaders about their vision, their challenges, and their priorities. Partnerships can thus be built on common ground. Cont…. Conclusion The potential opportunities and mutual benefits have never been greater for intrahemispheric cooperation. But **US policymakers must aggressively seize initiative** in turning that potential into reality. Certainly there are challenges and obstacles ahead, but **increased economic relationships** will take on a dynamic and momentum of their own, and once and for all render obsolete some of the retrograde populist agendas in the Americas. Geographic proximity, cultural and family ties, shared values, and growing prosperity are powerful incentives to drive a fundamental reassessment of US relations in the Western Hemisphere. **It is essential that US policymakers demonstrate the political will to take advantage** of this unprecedented opportunity.

### AT: Winners Win

#### Even legislative victories burn capital and harden opposition to the president

Eberly 13 --- coordinator of Public Policy Studies and assistant professor in the Department of Political Science at St. Mary's College of Maryland (Todd, “The presidential power trap; Barack Obama is discovering that modern presidents have difficulty amassing political capital, which hinders their ability to enact a robust agenda,” 1/21, <http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2013-01-21/news/bs-ed-political-capital-20130121_1_political-system-party-support-public-opinion>, CMR)

Barack Obama's election in 2008 seemed to signal a change. Mr. Obama's popular vote majority was the largest for any president since 1988, and he was the first Democrat to clear the 50 percent mark since Lyndon Johnson. The president initially enjoyed strong public approval and, with a Democratic Congress, was able to produce an impressive string of legislative accomplishments during his first year and early into his second, capped by enactment of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. But with each legislative battle and success, his political capital waned. His impressive successes with Congress in 2009 and 2010 were accompanied by a shift in the public mood against him, evident in the rise of the tea party movement, the collapse in his approval rating, and the large GOP gains in the 2010 elections, which brought a return to divided government.

**Winners-win theory is wrong --- Obama’s first term proves**

**Calmes 12** (Jackie, International Herald Tribune, “Obama looks to budget talks as an opportunity to take control of agenda; News Analysis,” 11/13/2012, Factiva, CMR)

Whether Mr. Obama succeeds will reveal much about what kind of president he intends to be in his second term. Beyond the specifics of any accord, perhaps **the bigger question hanging over the negotiations is whether** Mr. **Obama will go to his second inaugural in January with an achievement that starts to rewrite the unflattering leadership narrative that**, fairly or not, **came to define his first term** for many people.¶ **That story line, stoked by Republicans but shared by some Democrats, holds that** Mr. **Obama is too passive and deferential to Congress**, a legislative naïf who does little to nurture personal relationships with potential allies — in short, not a particularly strong leader. Even as voters re-elected Mr. Obama, those who said in surveys afterward that strong leadership was the most important quality for a president overwhelmingly chose Mr. Romney.¶ George C. **Edwards III, a leading scholar of the presidency at Texas A&M** University who is currently teaching at Oxford University, **dismissed such criticisms as shallow and generally wrong**. Yet Mr. **Edwards**, whose book on Mr. Obama’s presidency is titled ‘‘Overreach,’’ **said, ‘‘He didn’t understand the limits of what he could do.’’**¶ **‘‘They thought they could continuously create opportunities and they would succeed, and then there would be more success and more success, and we’d build this advancing-tide theory of legislation,’’** Mr. Edwards said. **‘‘And that was very naïve, very silly. Well, they’ve learned a lot, I think.’’**¶ **‘‘Effective leaders,’’** he added, **‘‘exploit opportunities rather than create them.’’**

**Rebuilding takes too long**

**Lashof 10** (Dan Lashof, director of the National Resource Defense Council's climate center, Ph.D. from the Energy and Resources Group at UC-Berkeley, 7-28-2010, NRDC Switchboard Blog, "Coulda, Shoulda, Woulda: Lessons from Senate Climate Fail," <http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/dlashof/coulda_shoulda_woulda_lessons.html>, CMR)

Lesson 2: Political capital is not necessarily a renewable resource. Perhaps **the most fateful decision** the **Obama** administration **made** early on **was to move healthcare** reform **before energy and climate** legislation. I’m sure this seemed like a good idea at the time. **Healthcare** reform **was popular**, was seen as an issue that the public cared about on a personal level, **and** was **expected to unite Democrats** from all regions. **White House officials and Congressional leaders reassured environmentalists** with their theory **that success breeds success**. A quick victory on healthcare reform would renew Obama’s political capital, some of which had to be spent early on to push the economic stimulus bill through Congress with no Republican help. **Healthcare** reform **was** eventually enacted, **but only after an exhausting battle that** eroded public support, **drained political capital and created the Tea Party movement.** **Public support** for healthcare reform **is slowly rebounding** as some of the early benefits kick in and **people realize that the forecasted Armageddon is not happening**. **But this is occurring too slowly to rebuild Obama’s political capital** in time **to help push climate legislation across the finish line.**

**Latin Economic Engagement link - Immigration Specific Spillover\***

**drains capital and specifically derails immigration bill - Perceived as kowtowing, downplaying emphasis and focus on key security issues and drug war**

**Shear, 13**

(Michael, NYT White house correspondent, 5/5, <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/05/05/world/americas/in-latin-america-us-shifts-focus-from-drug-war-to-economy.html?pagewanted=all>)

Last week, Mr. Obama returned to capitals **in Latin America** with a vastly different message. **Relationships with countries racked by drug violence and organized crime should focus more on economic development** and less on the endless battles against drug traffickers and organized crime capos that have left few clear victors. The countries, Mexico in particular, need to set their own course on security, with the United States playing more of a backing role. **That approach runs the risk of being seen as kowtowing to governments more concerned about their public image than the underlying problems** tarnishing it. Mexico, which is **eager to play up** its **economic growth**, has mounted an aggressive effort to play down its crime problems, going as far as to encourage the news media to avoid certain slang words in reports. “The problem will not just go away,” said Michael Shifter, president of the Inter-American Dialogue. “**It needs** to be tackled head-on, with a comprehensive **strategy** that includes but goes **beyond stimulating economic growth** and alleviating poverty. **“Obama becomes vulnerable to the charge of downplaying the region’s overriding issue**, **and the chief obstacle to economic progress**,” he added. “It is fine to change the narrative from security to economics as long as the reality on the ground reflects and fits with the new story line.” Administration officials insist that Mr. Obama remains cleareyed about the security challenges, but the new emphasis corresponds with a change in focus by the Mexican government. The new Mexican president, Enrique Peña Nieto, took office in December vowing to reduce the violence that exploded under the militarized approach to the drug war adopted by his predecessor, Felipe Calderón. That effort left about 60,000 Mexicans dead and appears not to have significantly damaged the drug-trafficking industry. In addition to a focus on reducing violence, which some critics have interpreted as taking a softer line on the drug gangs, Mr. Peña Nieto has also moved to reduce American involvement in law enforcement south of the border. With friction and mistrust between American and Mexican law enforcement agencies growing, Mr. Obama suggested that the United States would no longer seek to dominate the security agenda. “It is obviously up to the Mexican people to determine their security structures and how it engages with other nations, including the United States,” he said, standing next to Mr. Peña Nieto on Thursday in Mexico City. “But the main point I made to the president is that we support the Mexican government’s focus on reducing violence, and we look forward to continuing our good cooperation in any way that the Mexican government deems appropriate.” In some ways, conceding leadership of the drug fight to Mexico hews to a guiding principle of Mr. Obama’s foreign policy, in which American supremacy is played down, at least publicly, in favor of a multilateral approach. But **that philosophy could collide with the concerns of lawmakers in Washington, who** have **expressed frustration with what they see as** a **lack of clarity in** Mexico’s **security plans**. And **security analysts say** the **entrenched corruption** in Mexican law enforcement **has long clouded the partnership** with their American counterparts. Putting Mexico in the driver’s seat on security marks a shift in a balance of power that has always tipped to the United States and, analysts said, **will carry political risk as Congress negotiates an immigration bill that is expected to include provisions for tighter border security.** “If there is a **perception in the U.S. Congress that security cooperation is weakening**, that **could play into the hands of those who oppose immigration reform,” said** Vanda Felbab-**Brown, a counternarcotics expert at** the **Brookings** Institution in Washington. “Realistically, the border is as tight as could be and there have been few spillovers of the violence from Mexico into the U.S.,” she added, but **perceptions count in Washington “and can be easily distorted**.” “**Drugs** today **are not very important to the U.S. public over all,”** she added, “**but they are important to committed drug warriors who are politically powerful.”** Representative Michael T. **McCaul**, a Texas Republican who is **chair**man **of the Homeland Security Committee, has warned against** the danger of **drug cartels** forming **alliances with terrorist groups**. “While these threats exist, you would be surprised to find that the administration thinks its work here is done,” he wrote in an opinion article for Roll Call last month, pressing for more border controls in the bill. The Obama administration has said any evidence of such cooperation is very thin, but even without terrorist connections, drug gangs pose threats to peace and security. Human rights advocates said they feared the United States would ease pressure on Mexico to investigate disappearances and other abuses at the hands of the police and military, who have received substantial American support. The shift in approach “suggests that the Obama administration either doesn’t object to these abusive practices or is only willing to raise such concerns when it’s politically convenient,” said José Miguel Vivanco, director of Human Rights Watch’s Americas division. Still, administration officials have said there may have been an overemphasis on the bellicose language and high-profile hunts for cartel leaders while the real problem of lawlessness worsens. American antidrug aid is shifting more toward training police and shoring up judicial systems that have allowed criminals to kill with impunity in Mexico and Central America. United States officials said Mr. Obama remains well aware of the region’s problems with security, even as he is determined that they not overshadow the economic opportunities. It is clear Mr. Obama, whatever his words four years ago, now believes there has been too much security talk. In a speech to Mexican students on Friday, Mr. Obama urged people in the two countries to look beyond a one-dimensional focus on what he called real security concerns, saying it is “time for us to put the old mind-sets aside.” And he repeated the theme later in the day in Costa Rica, lamenting that **when it comes to the United States and Central America,** “so **much of the focus ends up being on security**.” “We also have to recognize that problems like narco-trafficking arise in part when a country is vulnerable because of poverty, because of institutions that are not working for the people, because young people don’t see a brighter future ahead,” Mr. Obama said in a news conference with Laura Chinchilla, the president of Costa Rica.

**Latin America links - general**

**New Latin Economic Engagement Initiatives cause massive PC loss – no turns**

**Isacson, 11**

Adam, Senior Associate @ WOLA, Washington Office on Latin America, Areas of Expertise: Regional and Military Security Policy, Arms Transfers, Civil-Military Relations, Colombia, International Drug Policy, Mexico, Peace Processes, U.S. Assistance, Adam Isacson is a key member of WOLA’s Regional Security Policy team. He is a leading expert on defense, civil-military relations, and U.S. security assistance to the Americas. He collaborates on Just the Facts—a constantly updated source of information and analysis of the United States’ often troubled relationship with Latin America’s militaries. He helped found Just the Facts in the early 1990s. Mr. Isacson has co-authored dozens of publications, including “Ready, Aim, Foreign Policy” and “Waiting for Change,” which examine the increasing role of the military in U.S. foreign policy. During the 2000s, Mr. Isacson focused on Colombia, the principal destination of U.S. aid to Latin America at the time. At the end of the decade, he published “Don’t Call It a Model,” a comprehensive look at the lessons to be learned from Plan Colombia. He has testified before Congress on international drug policy, Colombia’s conflict, U.S. military aid programs and human rights, and has organized several congressional delegations to the region. He is “among the few in Washington who genuinely affect how policy-makers in Congress and the administration shape their decisions and policy proposals,” says a congressional staffer who closely follows Latin America policy. He is known for his pithy commentary, shared online daily through regular contributions to Just the Facts and other blogs. Among Latin America analysts, he has been a leader in cutting-edge use of technology for transparency, instant analysis, and advocacy. Mr. Isacson joined WOLA in 2010 after fourteen years working on Latin American and Caribbean security issues with the Center for International Policy (CIP). Before WOLA and CIP, he worked for the Arias Foundation for Peace and Human Progress in San José, Costa Rica as a program assistant for demilitarization. 3/10, http://www.wola.org/commentary/president\_obama\_s\_upcoming\_trip\_to\_latin\_america

Though Latin Americans’ perceptions of the United States have improved since a low point during the Bush administration, our country is no longer the central player in the economic lives of most **Latin American** countries, either through **trade or aid**. As a result, it **carries much less political weight**. Though it is not his intention, President Obama’s trip will underscore that the era of unquestioned U.S. leadership has ended, as the President himself acknowledged at the 2009 Summit of the Americas, when he emphasized building an “equal partnership” with the region’s states. In this new reality, the White House has made an astute choice of countries to visit. Each carries great symbolic value. • In Brazil, President Obama’s discussions with President Dilma Rousseff will highlight the global power and influence of South America’s rapidly growing giant. It may also mark a notable improvement in the tone of U.S. relations with Rousseff’s government, which assumed power in January. • In both Brazil and Chile, President Obama will recognize the success of long, difficult transitions from military dictatorship to democracy. Both countries are still trying to uncover the truth about the mass human rights abuses committed before those transitions began, and to hold the worst abusers accountable. The President would do well to acknowledge these important efforts. • In El Salvador, the President will be commemorating a successful transition from all-out civil war to stable peace, with a democracy so healthy that, following its 2009 elections, it underwent a smooth transition of power to the opposition: the party of the former guerrilla insurgency. President Obama’s trip is also important for what it is not “about.” This is not a visit driven by U.S. threat perceptions. Except for where it touches discussions of public security and organized crime, drugs — and the U.S. “war” on them — are not on the agenda. Nor should we expect much discussion of terrorism, Iran or even Venezuela. The focus on opportunities instead of threats is very welcome. Not all of the messages will be positive, however. **In a time of** reduced power and **deep budget cuts**, President **Obama will be arriving largely empty-handed. There is relatively little new economic aid to offer**; much of what the Administration can propose is re-programming to meet priority needs, improved coordination, and technical assistance. These are important, but not a substitute for new assistance and new initiatives. Not only can **we expect few offers of new economic aid**, we can expect **few commitments to spend substantial political capital**. **The administration, though supportive, is unlikely to make a major political commitment to help Latin America address** what, according to opinion polls throughout the region, are **its main concerns**: public **security, unemployment, weak institutions**, and migration. While crime and violence will be mentioned in Brazil and El Salvador, **the most** President **Obama is likely to offer is a commitment to maintain modest existing levels of assistance for** police and judicial **institution-building**. On the **economy and jobs**, the President will visit Chile and Brazil, whose growth rates dwarf our own. In his visit to El Salvador, whose economy is only beginning to recover from the financial crisis that hit the United States, **the President is likely to support** targeted anti-poverty efforts, but **no major new initiatives**. Strengthening institutions requires supporting reformers both in government and civil society, including human rights defenders and leaders of unions and social movements — something on which the U.S. record is mixed. On migration — a third-rail political issue in today’s Washington — we can expect little. (El Salvador seeks a long-term resolution of the status of the two hundred thousand Salvadorans still here on a “temporary protected” basis, but no immediate solution is at hand.) We will hear words like “partnership” and “**engagement**” used quite heavily and repeatedly in the course of this trip. This is certainly the right tone to take. But those words **have little meaning**, though, **if they don’t come with a commitment to expend resources — both political and financial** — to help our “partners” address their own concerns, **even if it** occasionally **displeases a domestic political constituency**. True partners are also **willing to admit** when their **policies are not working**, rather than forge blindly ahead as we have done **in Cuba**, **the drug war**, our **trade policy and elsewhere**. Latin America no longer revolves around the U.S. “sun,” and our policy toward the region can no longer act as though it does. Let’s hope that the tone and content of the President’s visit reflect that.

**Latin engagement drains Obama PC –GOP backlash, empirics, and perception of appeasement**

**Padgett, 10** (Tim, Latin America Bureau Chief @ Time Magazine last 14 years, 8/23, <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,2013820,00.html>)

**Proponents** of doing just that **insist there's more consensus** than ever in the U.S. to ditch the Cuba embargo and its travel ban, which, after almost 50 years, have utterly failed to dislodge the Castro regime. **Opening** Cuba to Americans, they believe, **will do more to stimulate democratization** there **than isolating** it has. Even a majority of Cuban Americans now agree. **Still, for all the good vibes** the bill's backers feel from the White House right now, **some note warily that Obama has been loath to spend political capital in** Cuba, or the rest of **Latin America** for that matter. **Critics, for example, point to his decision last year to stop applying pressure against** coup **leaders in Honduras**, who'd ousted a leftist President, **when conservative Republicans in Congress objected.** Embargo supporters, including Cuban-American Senator Robert Menendez of New Jersey, a Democrat, are already blasting Obama's plans to relax Cuba travel. "This is not the time to ease the pressure on the Castro regime," Menendez said this month, insisting it will only give the brothers "a much needed infusion of dollars that will only extend their reign of oppression." As a result, says one congressional aide who asked not to be identified, **when it comes time for the White House to** give the bill more full-throated **support**, "there's a fear **they may just decide that the fight's not worth it."**

**Economic Engagement initiatives in Latin America require Obama push and drain PC**

**Oppenheimer, 13**

Andres, American editor and foreign affairs columnist @ Miami Herald. author of “Saving the Americas” and four other best-selling books, co-winner of the 1987 Pulitzer Prize as a member of The Miami Herald team that uncovered the Iran-Contra scandal. He won the Inter-American Press Association Award twice (1989 and 1994), and the 1997 award of the National Association of Hispanic Journalists, selected by the Forbes Media Guide as one of the “500 most important journalists” of the United States in 1993, and by Poder Magazine as one of the “100 most powerful people” in Latin America in 2002 and 2008, Miami Herald, 5/8,

<http://www.miamiherald.com/2013/05/08/3387818/andres-oppenheimer-obama-should.html>

I’ve read with great attention President Barack **Obama’s article** in The Miami Herald earlier this week on how to improve U.S. relations with Latin America. It was pretty disappointing. The article, headlined “Improving our Partnership” and published after Obama’s return from a trip to Mexico and Costa Rica, says that “this is a moment of great promise for our hemisphere” and is full of feel-good talk about the future of the Americas. But, sadly, it **showed the absence of any U.S. plans to** drastically **expand trade ties with Latin America** — like the Obama administration has done with Asia and Europe — **or any sign that, in his second term, Obama will pay greater attention to this hemisphere.** Before we get into what Obama should do, let’s take a quick look at the facts. In his article, Obama stated that about 40 percent of U.S. exports are currently going to Latin America, and that these exports are growing at a faster pace than U.S. shipments to the rest of the world. Also, Obama celebrated that the U.S. Congress is finally close to approving comprehensive immigration reform. While that’s a U.S. domestic issue, it would have a positive economic impact on Mexico and Central America, since millions of newly legalized immigrants would be able to visit their native countries, and would most likely be sending more money to their families back home. But here are some of the facts that Obama failed to mention in his article: • U.S. total trade with Latin America has actually fallen as a percentage of total U.S. trade over the past decade. While 39 percent of overall U.S. trade was with the Western Hemisphere in 2000, that percentage fell to 38 percent in 2012, according to U.S. Department of Commerce data. • Despite Obama’s May 23, 2008, campaign promise to launch “a new alliance of the Americas,” he has not started any major hemispheric free trade initiative. By comparison, every recent U.S. president had started — or at least tried to start — a hemisphere-wide trade deal. • Obama has launched the Trans-Pacific Partnership free trade talks with mostly Asian countries, and a similar Trans-Atlantic Partnership free trade negotiation with the 27-member European Union, but has not announced any plans for a Trans-American Partnership. Granted, he has helped ratify free trade deals with Colombia and Panama, which had been signed by his predecessor. And, sure, the Trans-Pacific Partnership plan includes a few Latin American countries, such as Mexico, Peru and Chile, but they are a minority within the proposed new bloc. • In his May 2 trip to Mexico, Obama failed to meet Mexico’s request to be included in the U.S.-proposed Trans-Atlantic partnership free trade talks with the European Union. The Mexican governments had asked that Mexico and Canada be included in the Trans-Atlantic Partnership plan, so that the proposed deal could become a North American-European Union deal. But the White House response was, not yet. • Despite **Obama’s** 2011 announcement of a plan to increase to 100,000 the number of Latin American students in U.S. colleges, and to 100,000 the number of U.S. students in Latin American universities — his most ambitious **initiative for the region** — **progress** on the project **has been slow**. The plan calls for significant private sector funding, but **Obama has invested little time, or political capital, in it.** Fund-raising has been left in charge of the State Department, whose boss — Secretary of State John Kerry — has **shown scant interest in Latin America**. Kerry did not travel with Obama to Mexico and Costa Rica last week, and his April 18 remark at a congressional hearing about Latin America being “our backyard” had the rare effect of antagonizing friends and foes alike in the region. My opinion: As regular readers of this column know well, I much prefer Obama over his Republican critics on most issues. But I find it unfortunate that, as Obama’s recent trade initiatives with Asia and Europe show, he looks East and West, but very little toward the South. **Neither he,** nor Kerry, **nor any Cabinet-level official is focused on the region.** Perhaps it’s too late to expect any changes. But the least Obama could do is get personally involved in the projects he has already launched. For instance, he should pick up the phone and ask CEO’s of top multinationals to chip in funds for his plan to raise student exchanges with Latin America to 100,000 in both directions. **If Obama doesn’t get personally involved, not even that will happen**.

**Engagement/Appeasement links – Yes Spillover**

**Engagement and accusations of appeasement drain PC and trades off with obamas agenda**

**Dueck, 11**

Colin Dueck,professor at the Department of Public and International Affairs, George Mason University, October 1, 2011

policy review » no. 169, <http://www.hoover.org/publications/policy-review/article/94006>

Any grand strategy or overall foreign policy strategy does several things. First, it specifies certain national goals or ends. Second, it identifies the policy instruments or means by which national goals will be pursued. These instruments might include, for example, diplomatic commitments, military intervention, foreign aid, and/or economic sanctions. Any viable strategy must ensure that means and ends are well matched. Commitments must not exceed capabilities. Yet strategy — unlike say, sculpture — also recognizes that our targets are animate objects, with the ability to respond, make choices, and fight back. Consequently, effective foreign policy strategists must and do strike a fine balance. On the one hand, they need to know what they want. On the other, they must be flexible as to how exactly they pursue it, given the inevitable surprises resulting from pushback by other actors within the international system. The primary ends and means of **Obama’s** foreign policy strategy can be inferred from both his actions and his words, which have been broadly consistent since his election to the White House. To begin, his **chief policy interest is** not in the international realm at all, but in **the domestic**. Obama’s leading motivation for becoming president, as he himself has said, was not simply to get elected, much less to focus on foreign affairs, but to “remake America.” He aims at and has already achieved dramatic liberal or progressive reforms in numerous domestic policy areas such as health care and financial regulation. **This focus on liberal domestic reform has several implications for American grand strategy, as Obama well knows**. First, it means that resources must be shifted in relative terms from national security spending to domestic social and economic spending — a shift clearly visible in recent federal budgets. Second, **it means steering clear of partisan political fights over national security that might detract from Obama’s overall political capital**. Third, it means that potentially costly new international entanglements must for the most part be avoided. Sometimes these three imperatives are in tension with one another. For example, in the autumn of 2009, **Obama** was tempted to begin winding down America’s military engagement in Afghanistan, yet at the same time **wanted to avoid appearing weak** on terrorism. So he settled on an approach that called for temporary U.S. escalation in Afghanistan, resolved by subsequent disengagement beginning in July 2011. **That approach** was hardly optimal militarily, but it **was the least bad policy for Obama in domestic political terms given his overarching priorities.** As with some previous presidents, such as Richard Nixon, an overall shift toward American strategic retrenchment is masked by temporary or short-term military escalations. So it is with Obama. The current president’s central reason for international retrenchment, however, is not really America’s economic insolvency per se, since he has actually added to that insolvency in dramatic fashion, but rather the concern that foreign commitments and **national security disputes might detract** money, **time, and attention from his very ambitious domestic reform agenda**. Again, the main implication of such concerns in **Obama’s** case is an overall emphasis on international and military retrenchment, although one **tempered by the desire to pre-empt domestic criticism from foreign policy hawks.** The domestic political arguments for international retrenchment are matched and supplemented, in Obama’s mind, by a genuine philosophical case for a more accommodating American stance abroad. By all appearances **Obama** sincerely **believes**, and has certainly said repeatedly over the years, that **the U**nited **S**tates **should be more accommodating toward potential adversaries and rivals overseas** — accommodating of their interests, their perspectives, and their wishes. The reason is that through accommodation, these potential rivals can be turned, if not into friends, then at least into something other than adversaries. At least this is what Obama believes. He can certainly be cold-blooded when making short-term or tactical calculations in relation to clear, existing U.S. enemies. After all, this is a president who hunted down Osama Bin Laden, and has escalated the use of unmanned drone strikes — basically targeted killings — against suspected terrorists in Pakistan. So there are clearly certain international or transnational actors who in Obama’s view are irreconcilable to core American values and interests. But this category is very small, and it never seems to rise to the level of state actors. **The assumption appears to be** **that** virtually **any** nation-**state can be successfully engaged**, regardless of regime type. Even the Taliban, we are told by numerous administration officials, is chock full of people who can be peeled off through diplomatic negotiation and accommodated to American designs if only we have the courage to try.

**That’s specifically true for hostile countries like (Cuba/Venezuela)**

**Dueck, 11**

Colin Dueck,professor at the Department of Public and International Affairs, George Mason University, October 1, 2011

policy review » no. 169, <http://www.hoover.org/publications/policy-review/article/94006>

Look at how **Obama’s strategy of accommodation has played out in relation to** four categories of foreign governments: 1) those essentially hostile to the United States, 2) those who pursue a mixture of strategic rivalry and cooperation, 3) genuine American allies, and 4) Arab governments of varying allegiance. The first category, of **regimes** basically **hostile to the U**nited **S**tates**, includes** the governments of Iran, North Korea, **Cuba, and Venezuela, to name** only four of **the most notable**. Each of **these governments has literally defined itself at a fundamental level by violent opposition to America**. To think that a conciliatory tone, a preliminary concession, or a well-intentioned desire for better relations on the part of a U.S. president by itself will transform that hostility is simply naïve. In the case of Cuba, for example, the Obama administration began by lifting certain economic sanctions, in the hope of seeing some reciprocal concessions from the Castro brothers: political liberalization, an easing of anti-American hostility, anything at all of significance. No such concessions have been made. The case of Iran has already been discussed — Obama reached out to Tehran with great fanfare in 2009, and has received in effect a slap in the face. Both Venezuela’s Hugo Chavez and North Korea’s Kim Jong Il are likewise just as hostile and provocative toward the United States today as they were when George W. Bush was America’s president. This is because the fundamental barrier to friendly U.S. relations with those regimes was never George W. Bush. The fundamental barrier to friendly relations with these regimes is the fact that they are bitterly hostile to the United States. The kinds of **concessions** that Washington would have to offer to win their genuine **accommodation would be** so sweeping, massive, and **unacceptable, from the point of view of any likely U.S. president that they will not be made — and certainly not by** Barack **Obama**. Any smaller concessions from Washington, therefore, are simply pocketed by a hostile regime, which continues along in its basic antipathy toward the United States. So who is supposed to be the target audience here? The true audience and for that matter the ultimate source of these various conciliatory policy initiatives is essentially a small, transnational, North Atlantic class of bien pensant opinion who already share Obama’s core policy priorities in any case. They have rewarded him with their support, as well as with the Nobel Peace Prize. Others internationally are less impressed. And in the meantime, we may have lost something, in terms of the ability to seriously prepare for certain looming security challenges. A primary and continuing emphasis on diplomatic engagement after Iran has repeatedly rebuffed the United States does not help us to prepare for the possibility of a nuclear-armed Iran. A declared commitment to nuclear abolition does nothing to convince other nuclear powers to abandon their own arsenals, and may even be counterproductive in the sense that it deludes important segments of opinion into believing that such declarations actually help to keep the peace. Obama has said from the beginning that the purpose of his more conciliatory foreign policy approach was to bolster American standing in the world, but the definition of international standing has actually been highly self-referential in the direction of aforementioned transatlantic liberal opinion. In many cases overseas, from the perspective of other governments, Obama’s well-intentioned **conciliatory gestures are read as a sign of weakness**, and consequently undermine rather than bolster American standing. In one way, however, **Obama** has already achieved much of what he desired with his **strategy** of accommodation, and that **is to re-orient American** national resources and **attention away from national security concerns and toward** the expansion of **domestic progressive reforms**. He appears to sincerely believe that these liberal domestic initiatives in areas such as health care and finance will also bolster American economic power and competiveness. Actually they will do no such thing, since heavy-handed and constantly changing federal regulations tend to undermine investor confidence as well as long-term U.S. economic growth. But either way, **Obama’s vision of** a more expansive government role in **American society is well on its way to being achieved, without** from his point of view **debilitating debates over major national security concerns**. **In that sense,** especially **if he is reelected** in 2012, several of his **major strategic priorities will have been accomplished**. Any **good strategy must incorporate the possibility of pushback or resistance** from unexpected quarters. As they say in the U.S. military, the enemy gets a vote. So, for that matter, do other countries, whether friendly or not. When things do not go exactly according to plan, any decent strategy and any capable leader adapt. Indeed any decent foreign policy strategy begins with the recognition for backup plans, since inevitably things will not go exactly according to plan. Other countries rarely respond to our initial strategic moves in precisely the way we might wish. The question then becomes: What is plan B? **Obama is tactically very flexible**, but at the level of grand strategy he seems to have no backup plan. There is simply no recognition of the possibility that world politics might not operate on the post-Vietnam liberal assumptions he has imbibed and represented over the years. Obama’s critics often describe him as providing no strong foreign policy leadership. They underestimate him. Actually he has a very definite idea of where he wants to take the United States. **His guiding foreign policy idea is** that of **international accommodation**, sparked by American example. He pursues that overarching concept with great tactical pliability but without any sign of ideological or basic revision since coming into office. Yet empirically, in one case after another, the strategy is not working. This is a kind of leadership, to be sure, but leadership in the wrong direction. **Obama believes that liberal domestic initiatives will bolster American economic power and competitiveness.** How can the Obama administration adapt and adjust to the failures of its strategy of accommodation? It can admit that the attempted diplomatic engagement of Iran has failed, and shift toward a strategy of comprehensive pressure against that regime. It can make it abundantly clear to both the Taliban and al Qaeda that the United States will not walk away from Afghanistan, despite the beginning drawdown. It can start treating Russia as a geopolitical rival, which it is, rather than simply as a diplomatic partner. It can strengthen U.S. missile defenses as a form of insurance against nuclear proliferators. There is a long list of policy recommendations that can be made on specific regional and functional matters, but the prior and most important point is the need for a change in mentality. President Obama needs to stop working on the assumption that U.S. foreign policy concessions or gestures directed at the gallery of elite transatlantic opinion — whether on nuclear arms control, counterterrorism, or climate change — will somehow be reciprocated by specific foreign governments in the absence of some very hard bargaining. He needs to grasp that U.S. strategic disengagement from specific regional theaters, whether promised or underway, is taken as a sign of weakness in those regions and not simply as a sign of benevolent restraint. He needs to recognize that America’s international reputation consists not only of working toward his own definition of the moral high ground, but also very much of a reputation for strength, and specifically of a reputation for the willingness to use force. He needs to stop operating on the premise that past American foreign policy decisions are the ultimate source of much violent discord in the world today. He needs to be willing to divide the international system conceptually and operationally into friends and enemies, as they actually exist, and to support America’s friends while pressuring and opposing its enemies relentlessly. Finally, he needs to admit the limited effect of his own personal charisma on the foreign policies of other governments. The president of the United States is not an international community organizer. If the conceptual framework that underpins Obama’s foreign policy strategy is altered, then better policies will flow on a wide range of specific issues. Obama needs to be willing to support America’s friends while pressuring and opposing its enemies relentlessly. Admittedly, there is little chance that Obama will concede any of this. One of the things we know from historical example is that presidents tend to keep operating on their own inbuilt foreign policy assumptions, even as contrary evidence piles up. It usually takes either a dramatic external shock, or a new administration altogether, to bring about a major revaluation of existing assumptions. Curiously, this resistance to contrary evidence in foreign policy appears to be even truer of highly educated, self-confident, and intelligent people with core ideological convictions — a description that certainly fits President Obama. **Obama is malleable on tactics**, and he takes great care to project an aura of sensible calm, but in truth **he is** a conviction **president powered by** certain core ideological beliefs and **vaulting policy ambitions**. His characteristic response when these core beliefs and ambitions are truly tested by opponents or events is not to bend, but to bristle. He is therefore particularly unlikely to admit or even perceive that a foreign policy strategy based upon faulty assumptions of international accommodation is failing or has failed. Nor is it politically convenient for him to do so. More likely, he will continue along his chosen path, offering nothing more than tactical adjustments, until some truly dramatic event occurs which brings his whole foreign policy strategy into question — an Iranian nuclear test, for example.

**increased engagement sparks domestic opposition and trades off with agenda priorities – Obama push is normal means and he get blame no matter what**

**Dueck, 11**

Colin Dueck,professor at the Department of Public and International Affairs, George Mason University, October 1, 2011

policy review » no. 169, <http://www.hoover.org/publications/policy-review/article/94006>

This leads us to one final, striking feature of Obama’s overall foreign policy strategy as it relates to questions of process and procedure. **Obama understands that when it comes to foreign policy, the president’s role is absolutely crucial. Presidents play the leading role in shaping overall U.S. foreign policy choices and priorities whether they want to or not**. **Inevitably, these choices and priorities involve domestic political and policy tradeoffs.** **Obama is** therefore **determined to keep the central foreign policy decisions in his own hands, and to make them with care**. To say that he prides himself on his analytical and decision-making capabilities would be an understatement. He has tremendous confidence in his ability to personally dissect, articulate, and manage various stages of the foreign policy process. He does not really believe that he needs one or more big-picture foreign policy strategists in the room when he is **making the crucial decisions**. **He is determined to play that role himself**. Under this system, Secretary of State Clinton is the public face of American diplomacy, a role she plays well, but she does not appear to be at the true center of decision-making on multiple issues Obama deems vital. Robert Gates was exceptionally effective as secretary of defense, and predominated within his bailiwick, but he did so in part by recognizing **Obama’s overall policy goals.** His successor Leon Panetta will no doubt grant Obama at least as much deference. The president’s first national security advisor, James Jones, was neither suited nor permitted to play the role of coordinator and honest broker between various agencies and departments. Jones’s successor, Thomas Donilon, was brought in to **help organize and rationalize the foreign policy process, precisely** because he is **sensitive to the president’s political needs**, and not because he is expected to play the role of grand strategist. **Obama is his own grand strategist, and whatever tactical adjustments he makes** on either process or substance, **he is not about to relinquish that role.** To sum up, despite widespread criticisms to the contrary, Obama does have an overarching foreign policy strategy, one which predates the Arab Spring and has outlasted it. This strategy simply does not fit neatly into the usual categories by which the subject traditionally operates. Obama speaks sincerely of the need for peaceful settlement of disputes abroad, but he hunts down Bin Laden and escalates militarily in Afghanistan and Pakistan. He is unsentimental about bargaining with hardened autocrats, but h**e expects patterns of international cooperation to spiral upward as a result of U.S. diplomatic outreach.** Consequently he is not easily categorized as a realist or an idealist, a hawk or a dove, because he has points of similarity and points of disagreement with each school of thought. And to say that **he is an internationalist**, as opposed to an isolationist, is true as far as it goes, but still presents the question: Exactly what sort of internationalist? The answer is, one **who believes in expanding possibilities for mutual accommodation** between nation-states, sparked by American example, **and in** the potentially integrative qualities of **his own personal leadership** on the world stage — all of which is intended not only to encourage international cooperation, but above all **to permit a refocusing on progressive domestic reforms within the United States.** THE FAILURE OF ACCOMMODATION It has now been almost three years since Obama entered the White House — plenty of time to assess the effectiveness of his foreign policy strategy. And it must be said that in important respects his strategy of accommodation has failed. Obama’s personal leadership has not really altered the basic dynamics of leading international or transnational conflicts and disputes. Nor have **American outreach, accommodation, and diplomatic concessions** triggered significantly greater international cooperation on issues such as nonproliferation. To some extent, of course, Obama **has been constrained in the implementation of his strategy by domestic political criticism or pushback on many of these issues**. Yet the failures appear to involve international pushback as well.

**New engagement initiatives derail Obama’s domestic agenda priorities – appeasement accusations, PC drain and focus tradeoff**

**Walt, 12** (Stephen, Prof Int’l Affairs @ Harvard, 12/28, <http://walt.foreignpolicy.com/category/region/east_asia>)

Back when Barack **Obama** began his first term, I argued that **we shouldn't expect much from his** handling of **foreign policy**. I was pretty sure he'd do a better job than his predecessor, but that's hardly saying much. Given the economic mess he inherited from George W. Bush, I thought **he'd have to focus** primarily **on the domestic side and play for time on the international front.** Equally important, **I didn't think there were any low-hanging fruit in the foreign-policy arena**; In other words, **there were hardly any significant issues where it would be possible to make a meaningful breakthrough in four years. I was** also **concerned** that **Obama's team was pursuing too many big initiatives at once** -- on Middle East peace, Afghanistan, nuclear security, climate change, etc. -- **and that they wouldn't be able to follow through on any of them. And that's exactly what happened.** Obama did get us out of Iraq, of course, but this merely involved following through on the timetable that Bush had already put in place and it hardly amounts to a foreign-policy "success." He also "got" Osama bin Laden, which is a gratifying achievement but not a game-changer in any meaningful sense. And devoting greater attention to Asia was an obvious move, although trying to forge a more cohesive coalition of Asian allies while avoiding rising tensions with China is proving to be as difficult as one would expect and it's by no means clear that they will pull it off. The other big issues -- Iran, Israel-Palestine, Afghanistan, climate change -- weren't going to be easy to solve in the best of circumstances, and a good case can be made that Obama mishandled every one of them. Certainly the situation has gotten worse in all four arenas, and none of them are likely to yield a strategic victory in the next four years. On Iran, Obama will face relentless pressure to resolve the nuclear issue once and for all. But because for years, Iran has been falsely portrayed as the Greatest Menace since Nazi Germany, etc., Obama has to demand concessions that Tehran is virtually certain to reject. There is an obvious deal to be had -- Iran would be allowed limited enrichment if it implemented the NPT Additional Protocol and the West would then lift economic sanctions -- but **any deal that does not involve abject** Iranian **capitulation would be attacked as "appeasement"** by Israel, its lobby here in the United States, and by other hawks. Assuming Obama resists pressure to launch a preventive war, this problem will still be in the in-box when he leaves the Oval Office in January 2017. Some **people think the second term is Obama's opportunity** to make another serious push for a two-state solution between Israel and the Palestinians. **They are living in a dream world**. It's true that Obama doesn't have to worry about being re-elected, but political conditions in Israel, among the Palestinians, and within the region are hardly propitious. **Obama won't be willing or able to exert** the kind of **pressure that might produce a deal, so why waste any time or political capital on it?** We might see a faux initiative akin to the Bush administration's meaningless second-term summit in Annapolis, but nobody with a triple-digit IQ takes this sort of thing seriously anymore. We're headed rapidly towards a one-state solution, and it will be up to one of Obama's successors to figure out what U.S. policy is going to be once the death of the two-state solution is apparent to all. The United States will get out of Afghanistan more or less on schedule, and Obama & Co. will do their best to spin it as a great achievement. Which it isn't. Once we leave, Afghanistan's fate will be determined by the Afghans -- with lots of "help" from interested neighbors -- and my guess is that it won't be pretty. But that was likely to be the case no matter what we did, given the inherent difficulty of large-scale social engineering in deeply divided societies that we do not understand. This is not good news for the Afghans themselves, but most Americans simply won't care. And don't expect any big moves or major progress on the environment, despite the accumulating evidence that climate change is real and could have fearsome consequences over the next 50 to 100 years. Obama has paid little attention to the issue since the Copenhagen Summit, and his own environment chief just resigned. It is also a massively difficult problem, given the costs of any serious solution, the number of relevant actors, the different perspectives of key countries like China and India, and the fact that today's leaders can always punt the whole problem to future generations. It is therefore hard to imagine a significant deal between now and 2016. What do I conclude from all this? That **Obama is going to pursue a minimalist foreign policy during his second term.** It won't be entirely passive, of course, and we certainly won't see a retreat to isolationism or the abrupt severing of any long-standing security ties. Drone strikes and semi-covert operations will undoubtedly continue (despite the growing evidence that they are counter-productive), but most Americans won't know what's going on and won't really care. In short, **expect to see a largely reactive policy that eschews bold initiatives and mostly tries to keep things from going downhill too rapidly in any place that matters**. If President **Obama is looking for a legacy** -- and what two-term president doesn't? -- it will be **on the domestic side**. He'll hope to end his second term with his health care plan firmly institutionalized, an economy in robust recovery, and with budget and tax reforms that reassure the markets about America's long-term fiscal solvency. Given where things stood in 2009, that's a legacy Obama would be happy to accept. **And the lofty international goals with which he took office**, and which won him the world's least deserved Nobel Prize? Well, **a lot of them were** smart and **sensible, but thinking he could achieve them** all **just wasn't that realistic.**

**New engagement policies drain obamas PC, trigger backlash and agenda trade off**

**EIU, 13**

The Economist Intelligence Unit, a division of London's Economist Group, is the most respected provider of country analysis for governments, multi-national corporations and financial institutions around the world. Through our network of over 500 international contributor economists, we establish independent macro-economic outlooks and detailed reports on the political and commercial environments for over 200 countries around the world, 1/19, <http://www.economist.com/news/briefing/21569719-barack-obamas-first-term-caution-was-understandable-he-must-now-show-greater-resolve-time>

Time to engage Barack Obama’s first-term caution was understandable, but he must now show greater resolve THERE is much to like about the **foreign policies pursued by** President Barack **Obama d**uring his first years in office. Rational and reasonable, they **have blended** strategic optimism with **tactical caution**, and tempered grand visions with **a careful weighing of costs**. Only one flaw has betrayed Mr Obama’s thoughtful plans. Time and again, they have not really worked. To his supporters, this is far from all the president’s fault. Where Mr Obama has gambled to no obvious benefit—whether extending open hands to Iran and Russia, offering a cold shoulder to North Korea, or trying to heal the Middle East by reaching out to the Muslim world, for example—supporters blame the intransigence of other players. Where **he has been cautious and slow to act**—at the first dawning of the Arab spring two years ago, in Syria today—aides point to the lessons about the limits of American power learned over more than a decade of war. Serving and retired officials, policy experts and diplomats from friendly governments express understanding for the meagre results of Mr **Obama’s** first-term **diplomacy**. They see **the logic of lowering ambitions and focusing sharply on that which can be achieved**. They sympathise with his **caution about confronting lobbies and special interests** as he sought re-election. But if **the president remains** as coolly calculating and **reluctant to engage** in his second term, even firm friends will find it hard to forgive. The darkest evening Thus America has sought to create the conditions for success—as in hotspots like Libya—while resolutely avoiding deeper entanglements. Anne-Marie Slaughter, director of policy planning at the State Department during Mr Obama’s first two years, talks of a global order in which America offers “tough love” while pressing rising powers to share the burden. The response to the bloodshed unleashed by Syria’s rulers against its people shows the difficulties of this approach; if you can’t find a desired outcome to catalyse, what do you do? The response of doing nothing leaves the administration’s inner circles miserable. Mr Obama has heard appeals to arm rebel groups, to impose a no-fly zone on Syria or take out the despot’s air forces on the ground. His response is to ask for evidence that such interventions would make things better, rather than satisfy the urge to “do something” at the risk of escalating the conflict. His second response is to ask for the price-tag: no small matter to a nation tired of war. Internal arguments have been passionate. Whom would you have us bomb, administration doves ask more hawkish types: snipers in cities? How much American power, they demand to know, would be needed to bring peace? After all, almost 150,000 American troops were in Iraq at the peak of its sectarian killings. So America is left rallying support for the formation of an inclusive opposition and preparing for the day after the Assad regime falls. The reluctance to act, says a witness to the debate, is understandable. It is also, he adds, a “shame on all of us”. Both critics of Mr Obama and many of his admirers would like to see greater engagement and resolve across three broad categories of endeavour. First come fast- and slow-burning crises that cannot be ignored, from the Middle East to North Korea. There is business from the first term—notably the withdrawal from Afghanistan—which could add to that sad roll-call if bungled. Second, there are opportunities too important to be shunned, from deepening free trade with Europe to the century-defining task of persuading China that its self-interest lies in an international order based on rules. And finally there are duties, often stemming from promises Mr Obama made when he first came to power, which have until now been shirked. Those include slashing nuclear stockpiles and writing rules for warfare in the 21st century that are worthy of America, a nation built on the supremacy of the law. **Important countries and regions are glaringly absent from the “to-do” lists circulating in official Washington** and its more influential think-tanks. **This reflects both a realistic sense of the limits on presidential time and attention, and brutal assessments of domestic American politics.** A Presidential Briefing Book from the well-connected Brookings Institution does not include a serious push on climate change (a key European wish) in its list of “Big Bets” for second-term action. It urges an easing of the Cuba embargo, but rising powers such as Brazil, Indonesia, Mexico, South Africa and Turkey feature mostly as sources of anxiety, with Mr Obama urged to work on keeping them aligned with a liberal, democratic world order.

**New engagement initiatives spark intense fights and powerful resistance that drain Obama’s finite capital and derail his agenda**

**Hadar, 9**

Leon T. Hadar is a research fellow in foreign policy studies at the Cato Institute in Washington DC, 5/11/9, http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/obama-must-move-beyond-pseudoevents

But style and media management aside, it is too early to conclude whether **Obama** will press ahead in transforming foreign policy pseudo-events into real events. His continuing **preoccupation with the economic crisis clearly limits his ability to launch** dramatic **diplomatic initiatives**. Doing away with the embargo with Cuba or reassessing US policy in the Middle East would **require costly fights with powerful forces in Washington**. For now, **Obama is expending his political capital elsewhere**. There is no doubt that through his personality and life-story, coupled with the manufactured media events, friendly gestures and cool style, Obama has been provided with an opportunity to change America’s global brand name. But the expectations created by the new president’s media image and style of foreign policy need to be matched to specific policy. Such **new initiatives in the foreign policy arena will force Obama to use his political capital.** Without a speedy end to the recession, **it is more likely that Obama will continue muddling through in the global arena** and refrain from enunciating any coherent grand strategy. The danger is that **political players at home** and abroad **will attempt to advance** their **policy agendas that** may **conflict with Obama’s**. If their efforts ignite a global crisis, that would test more than the new president’s style and public relations skills.

**Constructive engagement is broadly unpopular**

**Krepon ‘98**

(Michael, Co-Founder – The Stimson Center, LA Times, 1-18, Lexis)

Of course, **the demand for U.S. leadership** abroad **is as strong as ever, but congressional actions are making it harder for the executive branch to recruit followers**. In 1997, **one of every eight members of the House** of Representatives **voted for the** **U**nited **S**tates **to withdraw from the** **U**nited **N**ations, while one in four House members--including almost half the GOP caucus--support the United Nations' relocation. The chairmen of the Senate Foreign Relations and House International Affairs committees, Sen. Jesse Helms (R-N.C.) and Rep. Benjamin A. Gilman (R-N.Y.), drag their feet when it comes to repaying U.S. debts to the United Nations, supporting international inspections under the Chemical Weapons Convention, setting up an international monitoring network for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and implementing the agreement freezing North Korea's nuclear program. Elected officials who commute home by plane every other weekend are usually not eager to fly half way around the world to increase their work load. The PC, fax machine, 30-minute news cycle and cell phone have imposed burdens upon current members of Congress that earlier generations of politicians never knew. Elected officials such as Sen. Richard G. Lugar (R-Ind.), Rep. Howard L. Berman (D-Calif.) and Rep. Tom Lantos (D-Calif.), who do serious work abroad, are an increasingly rare breed. The most ardent isolationist members of Congress during the 1930s, like the former Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman William E. Borah, did not travel abroad. Another key isolationist senator, Arthur H. Vandenberg, visited London in 1942, where he experienced a German air raid. Later he became the key GOP architect of the Marshall Plan to reconstruct war-torn Europe. Like Borah before him, Helms dislikes foreign travel, having taken one official trip abroad during this decade. The second- and third-ranking House Republican leaders, Dick Armey (R-Tex) and Tom DeLay (R-Tex.), travel the U.S. widely, but not abroad. Other members largely confine their foreign travel to trips paid by private interests, facilitating the public labeling of any foreign travel, no matter how substantive, as junkets. In recent weeks, the Washington Post lambasted members of Congress for planning a trip to Ethiopia, Uganda, Zimbabwe and Mozambique, while the New York Times took senators to task for staying at too nice a resort during a useful trip to Panama, Honduras, Guatemala and Mexico. If members of Congress get hammered for visiting these countries, why not stay home? **The internationalist wing of the GOP,** once the bulwark of U.S. engagement abroad and the fulcrum for bipartisan initiatives on Capitol Hill, **is now barely represented in Congress**. **Foreign affairs-related support has declined** from 4% of the federal budget in the 1960s to 1% today, and at the insistence of the GOP caucus, the percentage is slated to drop to .05% in 2002. The changing perspective of the Republican caucus was clearly on display during Senate debate on the Chemical Weapons Convention's ratification. By a slim margin of 29 to 26, GOP senators barely supported a treaty originally negotiated by Presidents Ronald Reagan and George Bush. Skeptics conditioned their support to provisions weakening internationally accepted rules for inspections. Many Republican legislators seem locked into Cold War mind-sets: Despite Russia's steep decline, GOP legislative initiatives call for the continued deployment of no less than 6,000 strategic nuclear weapons, half on hair-trigger alert. **Meanwhile, Democratic members of Congress are turning inward** on foreign-trade issues. Fearing job losses despite low national unemployment rates, only 20% of Democrats in the House of Representatives were prepared to support "fast track" authority last November, down from 40% during the 1993 vote on the North American Free Trade Agreement. Even with scant support from his fellow Democrats, President Bill Clinton could have won had it not been for 25 Republicans who conditioned their approval on the elimination of family-planning funds for Third World countries in a pending foreign-assistance bill. As long as **members of Congress are hypersensitive to parochial concerns** and powerful single-issue advocacy groups, they cannot be expected to speak with authority for a broad conception of the national interest. Meanwhile, as the Congress has become more narrowly focused, argumentative and knotted, the exodus of contemplative and pragmatic legislators increases. Many Americans are now reacting to special-interest politics and mean-spirited campaigns by tuning out Washington's talking heads. But the more Americans seek insularity from "politics as usual," the more insular U.S. foreign policy will become. While opinion polls indicate that most Americans support foreign assistance, international trade, the United Nations, nuclear arms reductions and global environmental protection, **the political marketplace on Capitol Hill places greater value on intense partisanship than broad-but-shallow support. Constructive engagement abroad is not possible without greater political engagement at home**. The problem of congressional insularity is reaching pre-World War II proportions. Legislators are losing sight of the difference between the United States being an exceptional country, and demanding exceptional treatment by others on our terms. **Unless** concerned members of **Congress find ways to soften** and **reverse the** dual **trends of Republican deconstructionism and Democratic protectionism, Capitol Hill will flunk future tests of constructive international engagement,** short-changing the voting public and the national interest. Citizens either can blame Congress for political recidivism or reintroduce themselves to their representatives on Capitol Hill.

**No turns and trades off with top domestic priorities – polarization and lack of consensus ensures fight, PC loss, partisanship spillover and focus tradeoff**

**Weinstein 4** - Michael Weinstein, 11/12/2004, Professor of Political Science at Purdue University and a senior analyst with the Power and Interest News Report, Power and Interest News Report, p. http://www.pinr.com/report.php?ac=view\_printable&report\_id=235&language\_id=1

Reinforcing Factors from the Election As the Bush administration attempts to deal with persisting problems resulting in great part from actions taken during the President's first term, it will face difficulties that follow from the need to satisfy the constituencies that made for the Republican victory. The election confirmed that **the American public does not share a consensus on foreign policy and**, indeed, **is polarized.** It is also polarized on economic and social issues, along similar axes, **creating a situation in which any new policies proposed by the administration are likely to be met with domestic opposition and at the very least partial support**. **Besides being a drag on foreign policy initiatives, polarization also affects Washington's international posture by the attention and commitment that the administration will have to give to the domestic battles that it will fight in congress in order to push a legislative agenda** that will satisfy its constituencies. During his campaign and in his post-election press conference, Bush committed his administration to ambitious policy initiatives to take steps in the direction of privatizing Social Security and to reform the tax code radically. Both of those **plans,** along with tort reform and extension of tax cuts, **will generate fierce conflicts in congress and quickly exhaust the President's "political capital" available to win support on other issues.** The vision of an "ownership society," in which government regulations and entitlements are dismantled or scaled back, is the domestic equivalent of neo-conservative foreign policy; it is a utopian view with little chance of success. **If the administration seriously pursues its plans, it will be preoccupied domestically and**, consequently, **will devote less attention to world affairs**. Focus on domestic politics will be increased by the need to satisfy social conservative constituencies by appointing judges favorable to their positions on "moral values." Here again, there will be strong opposition if appointments are perceived by Democrats and moderate Republicans as too ideologically favorable to the religious right. **Protracted battles** over judgeships -- **whether successful or not** -- **would further diminish** Bush's **political capital for** foreign **policy initiatives by heating up partisanship**. It is possible that the administration will not pursue its agenda aggressively and will seek compromises, but that is not likely because of pressures within the Republican Party. The same constituencies that voted in Bush elected a Republican congress, and its members face reelection contests and the consequent need to satisfy their bases. Since Bush cannot serve a third term, Republican officeholders can no longer depend on his popularity to help carry them to victory. They also do not have a unifying leader with a political strategy to coordinate diverse constituencies. The combination of the lame-duck effect and the strategy void will drive Republicans to depend on their particular constituencies and press their claims assertively. The administration will be under pressure to push its domestic agenda vigorously at the same time that the various Republican factions fight for control of the party and Democrats move to exploit any weaknesses that appear. It is likely that Republican loyalty to Bush will be strained, further decreasing the administration's latitude and forcing it to bargain for support. The Republican majority is less solid than it might seem on the surface and includes factions that are at odds with administration foreign policy. Conclusion Persistent and emerging **political conditions all point in the direction of drift and reactivity in U.S. foreign** and security **policy** -- the election has intensified tendencies that were already present. There is little chance that a new security doctrine will be created in the short term and that a coherent political strategy will influence Republican politics. **Lack of public consensus will inhibit foreign policy initiatives, whether unilateralist or multilateralist.** Washington's **operative foreign policy is likely to be damage control**. As Washington drifts, the rest of the world will test it, probing for weaknesses. Under steady pressure from many sides, the Bush administration will be drawn toward retrenchment, retreat and eventually retraction in international affairs. The scenario of American empire has faded into memory and the prospect that the U.S. will eventually become a dominant regional power with some global reach becomes more probable.

**Drains PC and trades off with other priorities – its intrinsic**

**Rodrick, 1**

Dani Rodrick, professor of international political economy at the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, Foreign Policy, April, http://online.sfsu.edu/jgmoss/PDF/635\_pdf/No\_17\_Rodrik.pdf

**FREE TRADE-OFFS Most** (but certainly not all) **of the** institutional reforms **on the integrationist agenda are perfectly sensible**, and **in a world without** financial, administrative, or **political constraints, there would be little argument about the need to adopt them**. But **in the real world, governments face difficult choices over how to deploy their** fiscal **resources**, administrative capabilities, **and political capital**. **Setting institutional priorities to maximize integration into the global economy** **has real opportunity costs.**

**Engagement costs political capital**

**Haass and O’Sullivan ‘2K**

(Richard and Meghan, Fellows – Brookings Institution, **Honey and Vinegar: Incentives, Sanctions, and Foreign Policy**, p. 179-80)

Although the strong backing of domestic public opinion will always be valuable to those implementing an engagement strategy, it is the support of Congress and representatives of key constituencies and businesses that is critical to the success of engagement. While the American public at large may favorably view the use of incentives in foreign policy, **a general predisposition toward engagement is no substitute for the cooperation of lawmakers and organizations willing and able to devote vast amounts of political and financial resources to influence the course of a** **policy.** **Securing support for engagement among these critical actors in** democratic societies such as **the United States requires intense coordination between various branches of government**. As the case of North Korea aptly illustrates, too often engagement strategies are pockmarked by executive efforts to evade congressional involvement and congressional attempts to thwart executive endeavors. From the perspective of the executive branch, a strength of the Agreed Framework signed with North Korea was that it was not a treaty. While this technicality spared the agreement from the necessity of Senate ratification, Congress asserted itself later in the process through its reluctance to finance commitments made under the accord. While not initially standing in the way of the implementation of the framework, Congress has placed constraints and conditions on the provision of fuel offered to North Korea in return for abandonment of its nuclear ambitions.

**Constructive engagement is unpopular and requires political capital**

**Cortright and Lopez ‘05**

(David, President – Fourth Freedom Forum and George, Senior Fellow – Institute for International Peace Studies, “Bombs, Carrots, and Sticks: The Use of Incentives and Sanctions,” Arms Control Today, March 2005, http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2005\_03/Cortright.asp#Sanctions)

To be sure, **incentives-based negotiations are difficult to complete** successfully. **Doing so requires a significant domestic political consensus** that this goal is in the national interest, both in the country that would surrender such strategic weapons and in the countries that would aid them in doing so. **Attaining this consensus usually requires serious internal bargaining and runs political risks. The fraught history of U.S.-North Korean nuclear negotiations over the past dozen years highlights the potential political pitfalls of this approach**.

**Engagement/Appeasement links**

**engagement in adversary countries drains finite capital – 5 reasons**

* Recent empirics prove
* Perception of being “soft” on national security
* Engagement perceived as ineffective
* Perception of tradeoff with domestic priorities
* Key GOP leaders opposition

**Kurtzer et al, 11** (Daniel, US Ambassador, Princeton Policy Workshop The 2010 Princeton Policy Workshop is composed of twelve graduate students at Princeton University’s Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs and Department of History. Working under the direction of Ambassador Daniel Kurtzer, former U.S. ambassador to Egypt and Israel, the group examined the history and challenges of four case studies in the Middle East and then traveled to the region to gather relevant and diverse perspectives regarding U.S. foreign policy. The group developed recommendations to guide the Obama administration’s future decision making toward Syria and Hamas. In December 2010, the group presented its recommendations to the U.S. State Department’s Under Secretary for Political Affairs William J. Burns. Over the course of this process, the group consulted over 70 current and former officials, diplomats, scholars, and civil society leaders in Syria, Israel, the West Bank and the United States, as well as representatives from the United Nations, the European Union, and other international stakeholders. This policy workshop report represents the conclusion of the 2010 Policy Workshop. Recommendations were reached by consensus among the participating students, January, <http://wws.princeton.edu/research/pwreports_fy10/WWS591d.pdf>)

In his first address to a joint session of Congress in February 2009, President Obama proclaimed that “a new era of engagement has begun,” asserting that America “cannot shun the negotiating table, nor ignore the foes or forces that could do us harm.” Nearly two years later, President **Obama faces criticism** both **from those who argue** that **greater engagement with difficult actors has failed** to yield results **and must be abandoned,** as well as from those who contend that such a policy has not fully been pursued and needs to be given an opportunity to succeed. Foreign Policy in Context: Domestic Political Constraints on Policy Flexibility There are many challenges to compelling Syria and Hamas to play cooperative rather than destabilizing roles, and U.S. **domestic political constraints limit the Administration’s flexibility to** quickly alter its approach in pursuing **alternatives to sanctions and isolation as tools to generate** behavior **change.** For example, the Administration has been unable to secure Senate confirmation for its nominee for Ambassador to Syria, and it had to invest significant political capital to gain a minor change to the laws that govern the funding of a potential Palestinian unity government that includes members of Hamas. **This difficulty is not surprising**. As with any “State Sponsor of Terrorism” or “Foreign Terrorist Organization,” **once the U**nited **S**tates **ratchets up rhetoric** and sanctions, **it becomes politically perilous for an administration to suggest what may be perceived as a softer approach without significant and tangible concessions from the problematic actors**. Specifically, **because these states** and groups **often persist in speaking** and acting **provocatively as the U**nited **S**tates **considers its policy options, it is particularly difficult to make a compelling argument that engagement will be effective** in changing behaviors for the better. Political sensitivities are heightened when Israel is involved due to the deep ties between the two countries, the strong support for Israel in the U.S. Congress and among the American people, the impact of our policy toward these entities on Israel’s security, and the effectiveness of pro-Israel advocacy groups. **The political currents favoring policy inertia toward difficult actors**, including Syria and Hamas, **are further bolstered by** the continued **economic downturn**, **the prevailing opinion that more resources should be dedicated to solving domestic problems, the President’s limited political capital** in the aftermath of Democratic losses in the midterm elections, **and the highly skeptical view toward engagement of many Republicans** who will rise to **leadership positions** in the U.S. House of Representatives.

**drains PC – economic engagement sparks accusations of appeasement and weak foreign policy – anything that’s not a stick gets perceieved as soft**

**Feffer, 12**

John Feffer is the co-director of Foreign Policy in Focus at the Institute for Policy Studies, 9/6, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/john-feffer/obama-foreign-policy\_b\_1860816.html

Obama’s protean abilities have come to the fore in his approach to what once was called “soft power,” a term Harvard professor Joseph Nye coined in his 1990 book Bound to Lead. For more than 20 years, Nye has been urging U.S. policymakers to find different ways of leading the world, exercising what he termed “power with others as much as power over others.” After 9/11, when “soft” became an increasingly suspect word, Washington policymakers began to use “**smart power**” to denote a menu of **expanded options** that were to combine the capabilities of both the State Department and the Pentagon. "We must use what has been called 'smart power,' the full range of **tools at our disposal** -- **diplomatic, economic**, military, political, legal, and cultural -- picking the right tool, or combination of tools, for each situation," Hillary Clinton said at her confirmation hearing for her new role as secretary of state. "With smart power, diplomacy will be the vanguard of foreign policy." But diplomacy **has not been at the vanguard of Obama’s foreign policy**. From drone attacks in Pakistan and cyber-warfare against Iran to the vaunted “Pacific pivot” and the expansion of U.S. military intervention in Africa, the Obama administration has let the Pentagon and the CIA call the shots. The president’s foreign policy has **certainly** been “**smart” from a domestic political point of view**. With the ordering of the Seal Team Six raid into Pakistan that led to the assassination of Osama bin Laden and “leading from behind” in the Libya intervention, **the president has effectively removed foreign policy as a Republican talking point. He has left the hawks of the other party with very little room to maneuver.** But in its actual effects overseas, his version of “smart power” has been anything but smart. It has maintained imperial overstretch at self-destructive expense, infuriated strategic competitors like China, hardened the position of adversaries like Iran and North Korea, and tried the patience of even long-time allies in Europe and Asia. Only one thing makes Obama’s policy look geopolitically smart -- and that’s Mitt Romney’s prospective foreign policy. On global issues, then, the November elections will offer voters a particularly unpalatable choice: between a Democratic militarist and an even more over-the-top militaristic Republican, between Bush Lite all over again and Bush heavy, between dumb and dumber. Mr. Softy Goes to Washington Mr. Softy went to Washington in 2008 and discovered a backbone. That, at least, is how many foreign policy analysts described the “maturation” process of the new president. “Barack Obama is a soft power president,” wrote the Financial Times’s Gideon Rachman in 2009. “But the world keeps asking him hard power questions.” According to this scenario, Obama made quiet overtures to North Korea, and Pyongyang responded by testing a nuclear weapon. The president went to Cairo and made an impressive speech in which he said, among other things, “we also know that military power alone is not going to solve the problems in Afghanistan and Pakistan.” But individuals and movements in the Muslim world -- al-Qaeda, the Taliban -- continued to challenge American power. The president made a bold move to throw his support behind nuclear abolition, but the nuclear lobby in the United States forced him to commit huge sums to modernizing the very nuclear complex he promised to negotiate out of existence. According to this scenario, **Obama came to Washington with a fistful of carrots to coax the world**, nonviolently, in the direction of peace and justice. The world was not cooperative, and so, **in practice**, those **carrots began to function more like** orange-colored **sticks**. Cont…. Nor was diplomacy ever actually on the table with North Korea. **The Obama team** came in with a less than half-hearted commitment to the Six Party process -- the negotiations to address North Korea’s nuclear program among the United States, China, Russia, Japan, and the two Koreas, which had stalled in the final months of George W. Bush’s second term. In the National Security Council, Asia **point man** Jeffrey Bader **axed a** State Department **cable that would have reassured** the North Koreans that **a U.S. policy of engagement would continue. “Strategic patience” became the euphemism for doing nothing and letting hawkish leaders** in Tokyo and Seoul **unravel** the previous years of **engagement.** After some predictably belligerent rhetoric from Pyongyang, followed by a failed missile launch and a second nuclear test, Obama largely dispensed with diplomacy altogether. Hillary Clinton did indeed move quickly to increase the size of the State Department budget to hire more people and implement more programs to beef up diplomacy. That budget grew by more than 7% in 2009-2010. But that didn’t bring the department of diplomacy up to even $50 billion. In fact, it is still plagued by a serious shortage of diplomats and, as State Department whistleblower Peter van Buren has written, “The whole of the Foreign Service is smaller than the complement aboard one aircraft carrier.” Meanwhile, despite a persistent recession, the Pentagon budget continued to rise during the Obama years -- a roughly 3% increase in 2010 to about $700 billion. (And Mitt Romney promises to hike it even more drastically.) **Like most Democratic politicians, Obama has been acutely aware that hard power is a way of establishing political invulnerability in the face of Republican attack**s. But the use of hard power **to gain political points at home** is a risky affair. It is the nature of this "dumb power" to make the United States into a bigger target, alienate allies, and jeopardize authentic efforts at multilateralism. Cont… **Obama has mentioned**, sotto voce, **that Mr. Softy might resurface** if the incumbent is reelected. Off mic, as he mentioned in an aside to Russian President Dmitry Medvedev at a meeting in Seoul last spring, **he has promised to show more “flexibility” in his second term. This might translate into** more arms agreements with Russia, more diplomatic overtures like the effort with Burma, and **more spending of political capital** to address global warming, non-proliferation, global poverty, and health pandemics. **But don’t count on it. The smart money is not with Obama’s smart power**. Mr. Softy has largely been an electoral ploy. If he’s re-elected, **Obama will** undoubtedly continue to **act as Mr. Stick**. Brace yourself for four more years of dumb power -- or, if he loses, even dumber power.

**Even engagement supporters fight over mechanism specifics**

**Kupchan, 10** (Charles A. Kupchan, professor of International Affairs at Georgetown University and a Senior Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, Mar/Apr 2010, “Enemies Into Friends”, Foreign Affairs, Proquest)

Over a year into Obama's presidency, **the jury is still out on whether this strategy of engagement is bearing fruit. Policymakers** and scholars **are divided over the merits and the risks of** Obama's **outreach to adversaries** and over how best to increase the likelihood that his overtures will be reciprocated. **Debate continues on whether rapprochement results from** mutual **concessions** that tame rivalries **or** rather from **the iron fist** that forces adversaries into submission. **Equally controversial is whether the U**nited **S**tates **should pursue reconciliation with** hardened **autocracies or** instead **make engagement contingent on democratization**. **And disagreement persists over whether diplomacy or economic engagement represents the most effective pathway** to peace.

**Drains PC – if countries want it than GOP can spin an appeasement link**

**Cizilla, ‘9** (Chris, Columnist @ Washington post, 10/9, http://voices.washingtonpost.com/thefix/white-house/obama-keeps-his-eye-on-the-pri.html)

**The political downside** of winning the prize? **Expec**t some **Republicans** -- **and, particularly, conservative** talk show **hosts on television and radio** -- **to focus on the idea that Obama is** such a **beloved** figure on the world stage **because he has** essentially **capitulated to the demands of the international community.** Remember that when President Obama was greeted with huge crowds and limitless adoration as he traveled through Europe as a candidate, Sen. John **McCain** (R-Ariz.) **was able to turn his international popularity against him, raising questions about whether Obama was ready to stand up for America's interests**. **Although this event lacks** the same **campaign context, the same arguments will likely be made by** some within **the GOP**. "His winning the Nobel Peace Prize is **very bad for Obama politically**," said Republican consultant Curt Anderson. "**It will completely reinforce the notion that he is** all flash and no substance, all style, and **more popular in Europe than in America."**

**Link Booster – Yes Perceived as Appeasement**

**Congress and public *perceive* plan as ineffective appeasement – Obama either losses the spin game on engagement or requires massive PC to win it**

**Kurtzer et al, 11** (Daniel, US Ambassador, Princeton Policy Workshop The 2010 Princeton Policy Workshop is composed of twelve graduate students at Princeton University’s Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs and Department of History. Working under the direction of Ambassador Daniel Kurtzer, former U.S. ambassador to Egypt and Israel, the group examined the history and challenges of four case studies in the Middle East and then traveled to the region to gather relevant and diverse perspectives regarding U.S. foreign policy. The group developed recommendations to guide the Obama administration’s future decision making toward Syria and Hamas. In December 2010, the group presented its recommendations to the U.S. State Department’s Under Secretary for Political Affairs William J. Burns. Over the course of this process, the group consulted over 70 current and former officials, diplomats, scholars, and civil society leaders in Syria, Israel, the West Bank and the United States, as well as representatives from the United Nations, the European Union, and other international stakeholders. This policy workshop report represents the conclusion of the 2010 Policy Workshop. Recommendations were reached by consensus among the participating students, January, <http://wws.princeton.edu/research/pwreports_fy10/WWS591d.pdf>)

Securing Policy Flexibility through Clarity and Strength **While** the **Obama administration has sought to move away from** the **Bush** administration’s **policies toward hostile states** and non-state actors in the Middle East, **it has not made a clear, convincing case to Congress and the American people to justify its desired approach on policy and national security grounds**. In particular, **it has not effectively countered the arguments of those who believe that engagement constitutes appeasement and that it makes the U**nited **S**tates **weaker. It has** also **been unable to manage public expectations with regard to engagement and whether it can be expected to yield immediate results on the ground.** Therefore, an overarching recommendation is for the Administration to clearly outline its vision for the Middle East and its policy with regard to Syria and a potential Palestinian unity government. It should describe both its long-term goals and the concrete short-term steps required to realize these goals. Because we believe that the longterm goal of Middle East peace can only be secured with the buy-in of both Syria and the Palestinian constituency that Hamas represents, we propose that short-term steps should include pursuing greater engagement with Syria, and encouraging a Palestinian unity government, including members of Hamas. To gain policy flexibility amid domestic political constraints, the Administration should clearly describe how its policies contribute to furthering the national security goals of the United States, the peace process, and the security of Israel. With regard to Syria, it should emphasize that engagement is not an end in and of itself but a strategy for better securing U.S. interests, that pursuing greater engagement does not mean that the United States will cease to use other tools in its arsenal, and that, even though behavior change may not follow immediately, having sustained diplomatic contact is essential. It should note that the ability to conduct tough diplomacy with an ambassador on the ground is even more important at times of stress in the bilateral relationship, because it ensures that U.S. views are represented strongly, consistently, and directly. With regard to Hamas and a potential Palestinian unity government, the Administration should be clear that it is in the interest of the United States to secure a final peace settlement with a two-state solution that ensures Israeli security and broader regional stability. An important intermediary step then is to solidify a Palestinian interlocutor that represents a united Palestinian people to guarantee that any agreement achieved will be commonly upheld and will endure. The Administration cannot waiver in its commitment to Israeli and broader regional security, and it should continue to eschew direct contact with Hamas, but it should encourage reconciliation talks through which the capacity for moderation of members of Hamas can be explored. The Administration should then be prepared to recognize and fund a unity government in which all ministers – including Hamas ministers – vow to abide by all prior PLO negotiated agreements. **The Administration should make its case regularly** through the statements of its officials **before Congress and in public**, in reaching out to pro-Israel and pro-Palestine advocacy organizations **to build support, and,** to the extent possible, **in direct statements by** President **Obama** in the State of the Union, press conferences, and other policy addresses. **Without such clarity and consistency, the Administration will be unable to define its own political reality but, rather, will continue to be defined by the current political reality that too often portrays engagement as appeasement** and any disagreement with Israel as a challenge to Israel’s right to exist in peace and security.

**Symbolism --- engagement is *psychologically linked* with weakness --- drains capital**

**Smith ‘04**

(M. Shane, Research Assistant at the University of Colorado, Boulder – Conflict Research Consortium, Beyond Intractability, April, http://www.beyondintractability.org/m/incentives.jsp)

1.) **Symbolism:** David Baldwin argues that "[**n]egative sanctions have become psychologically linked with** such characteristics as **courage**, honor, and masculinity," **which are especially important in the international arena**. Thus, he continues, "**the states**man **who** would **use [incentives] risks being perceived by** both **foreigners** and his **domestic public** **as soft, weak, or lacking in toughness." [12] Therefore, the reputation -- and** by extension **domestic** and international **clout -- of a political leader may be damaged by offering incentives**, unless the leader does so from a position of perceived strength.

**Engaging Rivals (Cuba/Venezuela) – appeasement links**

**Engagement requires PC – spills over derailing Obamas top congressional priorities**

**Kupchan, 10** (Charles A. Kupchan, professor of International Affairs at Georgetown University and a Senior Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, Mar/Apr 2010, “Enemies Into Friends”, Foreign Affairs, Proquest)

I**F THE Obama administrations** tentative **engagement** **with** the United States' **rivals** **is to be more than a passing flirtation, Washington will have to conduct** not only deft statecraft abroad but also **particularly savvy politics at home**. **Progress will be slow and incremental**; it takes years, if not decades, to turn enmity into amity. **The problem for Obama is that patience is in extraordinarily short supply in Washington**. With midterm elections looming in November, **critics will surely intensify** their **claims that Obama's outreach has yet to pay off. In preparation, Obama should push particularly hard** on a single front, aiming to have at least one clear example that his strategy is working. Rapprochement with Russia arguably offers the best prospects for near-term success. Washington and Moscow are well on their way toward closing a deal on arms control, and their interests intersect on a number of other important issues, including the need for stability in Central and South Asia. Moreover, the United States can piggyback on the progress that the European Union has already made in reaching out to Russia on issues of trade, energy, and security. **Obama** also **needs to start laying the groundwork for congressional support. To help clear the legislative hurdles** ahead, Obama should consider including in his stable of special envoys a prominent Republican - such as former National Security Adviser Brent Scowcroft, former Senator Chuck Hagel, or former Secretary of State James Baker - to lend a bipartisan imprimatur to any proposed deals that might come before Congress. **He must** also **be careful not to overreach**. For example, his call to eliminate nuclear weapons altogether, however laudable in theory, may scare off centrist senators who might otherwise be prepared to ratify the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. **Obama should** also **be mindful of the order in which he picks his fights**. **If** advancing rapprochement with **Russia is a priority** for 2010, **it makes sense to put off heavy lifting with Cuba** until the following year. **It is better to shepherd a few key items through Congress than to ask for too much - and risk coming back empty-handed. Despite** the **numerous obstacles at home** and abroad, the **Obama** administration **should stick to its strategy of engaging U.S. adversaries**. Rapprochement usually takes place in fits and starts and, under the best of circumstances, **requires painstaking diplomacy and persistence**. But when it works, it makes the world a much safer place. That realization alone should help buy Obama at least some of the time that he will need if he is to succeed in turning enemies into friends.

**Drains PC, sparks appeasement criticism and political backlash – link alone turns case**

**Kupchan, 10** (Charles A. Kupchan, professor of International Affairs at Georgetown University and a Senior Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, Mar/Apr 2010, “Enemies Into Friends”, Foreign Affairs, Proquest)

M**any** of Obama's **critics** **have already made up their minds on the merits of** his **outreach to adversaries**, **concluding** **not only that the president has little to show for his efforts but also that** **his pliant diplomacy demeans the** **U**nited **S**tates **and weakens its hand**. Following Obama's September 2009 speech to the United Nations General Assembly, in which **he called for "a new era of engagement based on mutual interest and mutual respect" and "new coalitions that bridge old divides,"** **the conservative** commentator Michelle Malkin **charged that the president had "solidified his place in the international view as the great appeaser and the groveler in chief**." The historical record, however, makes clear that such skepticism is misplaced and that Obama is on the right track in reaching out to adversaries. Long-standing rivalries tend to thaw as a result of mutual accommodation, not coercive intimidation. Of course, offers of reconciliation are sometimes rebuffed, requiring that they be revoked. But under the appropriate conditions, reciprocal concessions are bold and courageous investments in peace. Obama is also right to ease off on democracy promotion as he engages adversaries; even states that are repressive at home can be cooperative abroad. Moreover, contrary to conventional wisdom, diplomacy, not trade, is the currency of peace; economic interdependence is a consequence more than a cause of rapprochement. **If** tentative **engagement** with U.S. adversaries **is to grow** into lasting rapprochement, Obama will need to secure from them not just concessions on isolated issues but also their willingness to pursue sustained cooperation. D**oing so will require Washington to make its own compromises** without dangerously dropping its guard. **Obama must** also **manage the domestic political perils that will inevitably accompany such diplomacy.** **Not only will** **he have to weather Republican complaints about his "apology tours" abroad**, but **Obama will need to make sure that Congress is ready** to support any deals that result from his diplomatic efforts. Should foreign governments take up Washington's offers of cooperation, they, too, will face dangers at home. In fact, Obama is in the difficult position of seeking peace with regimes whose viability may well be undermined if they reciprocate the United States' overtures. Washington is off to a good start in seeking to turn enemies into friends, but **the task** at hand **requires exceptional diplomacy** both abroad and **at home**. DIPLOMATIC COURTSHIP Some of the recalcitrant regimes Obama is seeking to engage will surely refuse to reciprocate. With such states, Washington, after a decent interval, should suspend the offer of accommodation in favor of a strategy of isolation and containment. But other regimes are likely to take up the offer. Thus far, Russia, Iran, North Korea, Cuba, and Myanmar have all demonstrated at least a modicum of interest in engagement with the United States. Russia has worked with the United States on arms control, stepped up its effort to contain Iran's nuclear program, and expanded access to Russian territory and airspace for military supplies headed to Afghanistan. Enveloped in domestic turmoil since its June 2009 election, Iran has taken an on-again, if mostly off-again approach to negotiations with the United States. It is clearly tempted by the offer to compromise on the scope of its nuclear program as a means of avoiding - or at least delaying; - a confrontation with the West. North Korea has been similarly tentative in engaging with Washington over its nuclear program. Meanwhile, Cuba has been expanding its diplomatic dialogue with the United States, and last fall Myanmar welcomed a visit from a high-ranking U.S. diplomat and allowed him to meet with the opposition leader Aung San Suu Kyi. These glimmers of progress notwithstanding, critics insist that trying to make deals with extremists is appeasement by another name. Drawing on British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain's infamous capitulation to Hitler at Munich in 1938, opponents of engagement claim that it will invite only intransigence and belligerence. As U.S. President George W. Bush told the Knesset in 2008, negotiating with radicals is simply "the false comfort of appeasement, which has been repeatedly discredited by history." Bush was certainly correct that accommodation had no place in dealing with a Nazi regime bent on conquest and genocide, but Chamberlain's fateful blunder should not tar all offers of accommodation as naive bouts of appeasement. On the contrary, the historical record reveals that the initial accommodation of an adversary, far from being an invitation to aggression, is an essential start to rapprochement. Such opening bids are usually the product of necessity rather than altruism: facing strategic overcommitment, a state seeks to reduce its burdens by befriending an adversary. If the target country responds in kind, an exchange of concessions can follow, often setting the stage for the rivalry and mutual suspicion to abate. In the final stage of rapprochement, top decision-makers bring around bureaucracies, legislative bodies, private interest groups, and ordinary citizens through lobbying and public outreach. Broader societal engagement is needed to ensure that rapprochement does not unravel when the leaders that brought it about leave office. To be sure, offers of accommodation may need to be balanced with threats of confrontation. Nonetheless, the historical record confirms that accommodation, not confrontation, is usually the essential ingrethent of successful rapprochement. The United States and Great Britain were antagonists for decades; after the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812, their geopolitical rivalry continued until the end of the nineteenth century. The turning point came during the 1890S, when the United Kingdom's imperial commitments began to outstrip its resources. London made the opening move in 1896, acceding to Washington's blustery demand that it submit to arbitration a dispute over the border between Venezuela and British Guiana - an issue the United States deemed within its sphere of influence. The United States responded in kind to London's gesture, agreeing to bring to arbitration a disagreement over sealing rights in the Bering Sea. Soon thereafter, the two countries amicably settled disputes over the construction of the Panama Canal and the border between Alaska and Canada. The United Kingdom was the only European power to support the United States in the 1898 Spanish- American War, and it went on to welcome U.S. expansion into the Pacific. As diplomacy dampened the rivalry, elites on both sides of the Atlantic sought to recast popular attitudes through ambitious public relations campaigns. Arthur Balfour, leader of the House of Commons, proclaimed in 1896 that "the idea of war with the United States of America carries with it something of the unnatural horror of a civil war." In a speech at Harvard in 1898, Richard Olney, U.S. secretary of state from 1895 to 1897, referred to the United Kingdom as the United States' "best friend" and noted "the close community ... in the kind and degree of the civilization enjoyed by both [countries]." With the help of lobbying groups such as the Anglo-American Committee, these changes in the public discourse ensured that by the early 1900s the United Kingdom had succeeded in befriending the United States. In 1905, President Theodore Roosevelt informed London, "You need not ever be troubled by the nightmare of a possible contest between the two great English-speaking peoples. I believe that is practically impossible now, and that it will grow entirely so as the years go by." HOW PEACE BREAKS OUT Other ins ta NCES of rapprochement followed a similar trajectory - as was the case with rapprochement between Norway and Sweden. As part of the territorial settlement at the end of the Napoleonic Wars, Denmark ceded control over Norway to Sweden in 1814. The Swedes promptly invaded Norway to put down a revolt against their rule, and the resulting union between Norway and Sweden that formed in 1815 led to decades of Norwegian estrangement from the Swedish. Rivalry between the two parties began to abate in 1905, when Sweden, confronted with resource constraints and pressure from Europe's great powers, accepted Norway's unilateral secession from the union. Norway reciprocated by dismantling its border defenses, and the two countries proceeded to resolve their outstanding territorial disputes. Their cooperation during World War I consolidated rapprochement, setting the stage for the eventual consolidation of peace throughout Scandinavia after World War II. Peace came to Southeast Asia in a comparable fashion. A militarized rivalry between Indonesia and Malaysia began in 1963, when Jakarta opposed the formation of Malaysia - a federation among Malaya, Sabah, Sarawak, and Singapore. In 1966, General Suharto took power in Indonesia and proceeded to back away from confrontation with Malaysia, primarily to redress the deteriorating economic conditions brought on by Jakarta's refusal to trade with Malaysia and by the international sanctions imposed in response to Indonesian belligerence. The two countries then exchanged concessions on a number of issues and teamed up with their neighbors to form the Association of Southeast Asian Nations in 1967, which has helped preserve peace in Southeast Asia ever since. Rapprochement between Argentina and Brazil followed a similar pattern. After decades of rivalry that had begun in the colonial era, mutual accommodation started to clear the way for reconciliation in the late 1970s. Argentina faced the prospect of a war with Chile and needed to reduce its other strategic commitments, and Brazil's more moderate leaders viewed rapprochement with Argentina as a way of undercutting the growing power of hard-liners in Brazil's security and intelligence apparatus. Argentina made the opening move in 1979 by finally reaching an accord with Brazil and Paraguay on the construction of a hydroelectric dam across the Paraná River, which flows through the three countries. During the 1980s, Argentina and Brazil exchanged concessions, cooperated on their nuclear programs, and deepened their political, scientific, and cultural ties. In 1991, they launched a regional trade pact - Mercosur - and soon thereafter engaged in joint military exercises, which brought Brazilian troops to Argentine territory for the first time since the 1860s. As these and many other episodes of rapprochement make clear, Obama is on firm ground in seeking to resolve long-standing rivalries through engagement rather than confrontation. This strategy is all the more attractive at a time when the United States is overstretched by the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq and by economic distress at home. Obama's outreach certainly entails risks and comes with no guarantee of success. But U.S. President Richard Nixon had no guarantee of a breakthrough when he went to Beijing in 1972, nor did Egyptian President Anwar al- Sadat when he went to Jerusalem in 1977. Even George W. Bush, who initially forswore dialogue with members of the "axis of evil," was by the end of his second term negotiating with North Korea, sending U.S. envoys to meet Iranian officials, and allowing U.S. forces to cooperate with the Sunni insurgents in Iraq who had spent the preceding years trying to kill Americans. When it is handled correctly, engagement is not appeasement; it is sound diplomacy. GETTING RAPPROCHEMENT RIGHT **As Obama pursues rapprochement with a host of different rivals,** **he faces** two main **challenges**: **how to handle the sequence and** substance of the negotiations and **how to manage the political fallout at home** and abroad**.** As for sequence and substance, Washington should be prepared to exchange concessions that are timely and bold enough to send signals of benign intent; otherwise, each party will be unconvinced that the other is sincere in its quest for reconciliation. At the same time, **Washington should not move too quickly or too boldly:** **overshooting** could make the United States and its potential partners strategically vulnerable, **intensify domestic opposition, and prompt both parties to retreat** to safer ground.

**Engaging Rival Countries causes congressional backlash — empirics and current policies prove**

**Kupchan, 10** (Charles A. Kupchan, professor of International Affairs at Georgetown University and a Senior Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, Mar/Apr 2010, “Enemies Into Friends”, Foreign Affairs, Proquest)

THE **HOSTILE HOME FRONT** O**BAMA'S SECOND main challenge is to manage the domestic backlash that regularly accompanies the accommodation of adversaries - one of the key stumbling blocks in past efforts at rapprochement. Anglo-American rapprochement** in the nineteenth century **on several occasions almost foundered** on the shoals of domestic opposition. The U.S. **Senate**, for example, **rejected a general arbitration treaty with the** **U**nited **K**ingdom in 1897. Meanwhile, the British government, fearful of a nationalist revolt against its accommodating stance toward Washington, hid from the public its readiness to cede naval superiority in the western Atlantic to the United States. General Suharto, well aware that accommodation with Malaysia risked provoking Indonesian hard-liners, moved slowly and cautiously - as did General Ernesto Geisel when Brazil opened up to Argentina. As the Nixon administration discovered in the 1970s, these governments were wise to be cautious. **Détente between the U**nited **S**tates **and the Soviet Union stalled** in part **because the White House failed to lay the groundwork** for it **at home and ran up against congressional resistance.** In 1974, for example, Congress passed the Jackson- Vanik amendment, which imposed trade restrictions in order to pressure the Soviet Union to allow emigration. **Like past leaders who advocated accommodation, Obama faces formidable domestic opposition.** When he pledged to pursue engagement with the Iranian government even after its troubled election last year, the Washington Post columnist Charles Krauthammer criticized Obama's policy of "dialogue with a regime that is breaking heads, shooting demonstrators, expelling journalists, arresting activists." "This," he wrote, "from a president who fancies himself the restorer of America's moral standing in the world." After the Obama administration revised its predecessors missile defense program, John Boehner (R-Ohio), the House minority leader, claimed that "scrapping the U.S. missile defense system in Poland and the Czech Republic does little more than empower Russia and Iran at the expense of our allies in Europe." **An even bigger challenge** **than parrying** these **rhetorical blows** **will be ensuring** that the concrete bargains struck in the service of rapprochement pass **muster with Congress**. If the United States is to ratify a deal on nuclear weapons reductions with Moscow and embrace the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, two-thirds of the Senate will have to approve. Even without a single defection from the Democratic caucus, the White House will need a healthy measure of support from the Republican Party, which has moved considerably to the right since it last shot down the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, in 1999. Scaling back sanctions against Cuba, Iran, or Syria would similarly require **congressional action, w**hich also **would not come easily**; **Congress would no doubt balk at the prospect** of ending the isolation of Havana, Tehran, or Damascus. **Jackson- Vanik, after all, is still on the books, even though the Soviet Union is no more and Russia ended its restrictive emigration policies long ago. In the face of such congressional hurdles, Obama should develop a legislative strategy** that supports his diplomacy sooner rather than later.

**Preventing congressional backlash still Requires PC—debate dominated by anti-engagement misperceptions**

**Kupchan, 10** (Charles A. Kupchan, professor of International Affairs at Georgetown University and a Senior Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, Mar/Apr 2010, “Enemies Into Friends”, Foreign Affairs, Proquest)

**BUILDING CONGRESSIONAL support for Obama's outreach** to adversaries **will mean debunking** **three myths** **that often** **distort public debate about strategies of engagement**. The first is **the presumption that Washington compromises its values and power by seeking rapprochement with autocratic regimes**. **U.S. officials and opinionmakers on both sides of the aisle share a commitment to democratization** for both principled reasons (democracies respect the rights of their citizens) and pragmatic ones (democracies are peaceful and cooperative, whereas autocracies are presumably belligerent and unreliable partners). Accordingly, even **if the** **U**nited **S**tates **succeeded in striking a deal** with the Iranian, the Russian, or the Syrian government, **critics would charge that Washington's behavior was morally tainted (for rewarding and strengthening autocrats) and naive** (because such governments cannot be trustedto keep their commitments). But Obama is fully justified in putting the democratization agenda on the back burner and basing U.S. diplomacy toward other states on their external behavior, not their regime type. Even repressive regimes can be reliably cooperative when it comes to their conduct of foreign policy. Argentina and Brazil embarked on the path of rapprochement when they were both ruled by military juntas. Suharto oversaw a campaign of brutal repression at home but nonetheless ended Indonesia's belligerent stance toward Malaysia and helped found the Association of Southeast Asian Nations as a pact to preserve regional peace. Striking bargains with repressive regimes does require making moral compromises. Doing so is justified, however, by the concrete contributions to international stability that can result. Washington should speak out against violations of human rights and support political liberalization around the world. But when nuclear weapons, terrorism, and matters of war and peace are on the line, responsible statecraft requires pragmatic compromise, not ideological intransigence. A second **misconception**, often **affirmed by opponents of engagement, is that pursuing rapprochement with an adversary means abandoning hope that its government will change**. On the contrary, doing business with autocracies has the potential to bring about regime change through the backdoor by weakening hard-liners and empowering reformers. Engagement with Iran, for example, could undermine a government that relies on confrontation with the United States to rally popular support and disarm the opposition.

**ineffective, ensures GOP backlash and appeasement accusations, not viewed as priority and trades off with focus on key domestic issues**

**Bandow, 12**

Doug Bandow, Senior Fellow, Cato Institute, International Journal of Korean Studies Vol. XVI, No. 2, Winter, 12, <http://www.icks.org/publication/pdf/2012-FALL-WINTER/2.pdf>

**Nevertheless, last year** the **Obama** administration **offered cooperation.** While refusing to provide additional food aid out of concern over inadequate monitoring, the administration offered flood relief **assistance.** The two nations restarted joint searches for the remains of American MIAs. The Lee government in Seoul moved in a similarly conciliatory direction.18 Most significant was the renewed **dialogue** between Washington and Pyongyang. Kim Jong-il’s government suggested the possibility of denuclearization along with a peace treaty. Secretary Clinton stated that “We are open for talks with North Korea, but we do not intend to reward the North just for returning to the table.”19 U.S. human rights envoy Robert King visited Pyongyang, and Stephen Bosworth held talks with North Korean Vice Foreign Minister Kim Kye-Gwan. The administration reacted with caution, as **skepticism of the likely results was high both within and without the administration**. **Washingto**n formally dismissed having talks for the sake of having talks and **insisted on concrete** North Korean **concessions**. At his October summit with President Lee President **Obama announced** that any DPRK “**provocations will be met not with rewards but with even stronger sanctions and isolation**.”20 **Defense Secretary** Leon **Panetta** visited the South shortly afterwards and **publicly expressed “skepticism”21** about any revived talks. He also warned about possible North Korean provocations, promising “strong and effective responses.”22 Nevertheless, there was speculation that Pyongyang hoped for aid and other economic benefits to offer tangible benefits along with propaganda for the upcoming centennial celebration. The North may also have feared the prospect of a more hawkish Republican winning in November 2012. Negotiations were underway at the time of Kim Jong-il’s death. Perhaps reflecting a collective leadership devoted to the status quo, the new regime in Pyongyang moved ahead without apparent interruption. In February Washington and Pyongyang announced a deal involving U.S. aid and a North Korean promise to halt nuclear activities, including uranium enrichment, and eschew nuclear and missile tests, with a hoped for, if not necessarily expected, revival of the Six-Party Talks. Despite some optimistic outside punditry, the administration may have viewed the agreement primarily as a probe of the North’s intentions: Secretary of State Hillary Clinton called it “a modest first step in the right direction.”23 However, the DPRK promptly announced a planned satellite launch, which the Obama administration claimed violated the accord. 24 Washington’s position was reasonable, but the agreement was ambiguous, and Pyongyang always had distinguished between missile tests and satellite launches. One theory was that, absent Kim’s death, the agreement would have been inked in December, leaving several months of implementation before the North Korean announcement. Then, Kim may have figured, Washington would have hesitated to back away. Whatever the reason for the North’s behavior—while generally in the wrong, Pyongyang is not without legitimate complaints about some U.S. and South Korean actions—**there was neither aid nor a return to the negotiating table.** Nothing of note is expected to happen before the November election. **The administration has no reason to expend political capital promoting a potentially controversial agreement** of uncertain life **with no prospect of political benefit. A second Obama administration likely would emphasize continuity**. Secretary Clinton’s expected departure should have little impact on administration policy. The most recent negotiating disappointment reinforces already substantial skepticism about the likelihood of any enforceable nuclear deal with Pyongyang. There is little enthusiasm for inking limited accords with insufficient specificity and open to DPRK attempts to sell the same concession twice. However, few observers have confidence that the North is prepared to sign and implement a more comprehensive settlement, especially in the midst of an unclear and potentially destabilizing leadership struggle. A second Obama administration likely would attempt to keep the DPRK talking and certainly would keep pushing Beijing to take a more positive role in promoting reform in the North. However, **absent noticeable changes** in approach in Pyongyang, President **Obama would have little reason to raise the priority** of North Korean issues. Likely Romney Policy toward North Korea **Current Republican Party attitudes on foreign policy have been largely shaped in response to** President **Obama.** In general, Mitt Romney and other **opposition** candidates **have charged** President **Obama with showing weakness, apologizing for America, appeasing America’s enemies, and threatening America’s position in a dangerous world**. The Republicans have tended to be low on specific solutions, instead promising to show “leadership,” “rebuild” America’s defenses, and demonstrate “resolve” against America’s adversaries.25 Romney was no different. He delivered **a major foreign policy speech** at the Citadel, a military-oriented college in South Carolina. Although he **offered a litany of** **“grave threats” and potential disasters resulting from the administration’s alleged failings**, he did not include North Korea among them. **He** only **brought up the DPRK alongside Cuba, Iran, and Venezuela as having “anti-America visions**.”26 **About these he** only **said American should be stronger.** Romney also warned against a more powerful China, but drew no specific linkages to Pyongyang. Past behavior suggests that Romney would be prone to move towards the center. He has a pragmatic reputation, routinely abandons previous positions taken, and has exhibited no expertise or interest in foreign affairs. Thus, he easily could drop his hawkish rhetoric and chart a more moderate international course. In the case of North Korea that might include some attempt at engagement through renewal of the SixParty Talks and perhaps bilateral discussions as well. This inclination could be reinforced by the reality that **the American people are most concerned about domestic issues, so it would be best** for him **to concentrate on economics and leave foreign policy issues** to traditional Republican elites. Even so, **it might take some time for a more moderate strategy to emerge out of more confrontational rhetoric**.

**Economic engagement in adversary countries can’t be a win – triggers GOP backlash, appeasement accusations, perceived as ineffective and trades off with domestic agenda priorities – korea proves**

**Bandow, 12**

Doug Bandow, Senior Fellow, Cato Institute, International Journal of Korean Studies Vol. XVI, No. 2, Winter, 12, <http://www.icks.org/publication/pdf/2012-FALL-WINTER/2.pdf>

After taking office, he only reluctantly addressed Pyongyang, preferring a policy of “strategic patience” until forced to react by multiple North Korean provocations. 5 Moreover, the agreement negotiated by the administration earlier this year was almost immediately violated by the North (which was suspected of conducting a missile launch in the guise of launching a satellite).6 That experience likely will reduce what little enthusiasm the administration might otherwise have had for any new approach to Pyongyang. Thus, **there is no reason to expect much change in approach** irrespective of who ends up in control of Korea policy **in a second Obama administration**. Policy toward the DPRK played virtually no role **in the** seemingly interminable **Republican** presidential **contest. None** of the candidates, including Romney, **offered specifics about approaching the North**. **For most of them North Korea was merely a convenient hate object to use when accusing Democrats of “appeasement.**”7 Romney has insisted that he would be firm toward America’s adversaries, which includes the DPRK, but his career is noteworthy for his willingness to abandon previous positions. Moreover, President George W. Bush, with a reputation for ideological extremism and constancy, dramatically moderated his approach to North Korea in his second term. A similar change is possible if another hawkish Republican is elected president. Cont…The North’s nuclear activities were exposed in 1990, followed by Pyongyang’s signing of a safeguards agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency.8 After the DPRK banned IAEA inspections, President Bill Clinton considered options ranging from military action, ultimately rejected by the administration, to diplomacy, which resulted in the 1994 Agreed Framework. **Disagreements were sharp**, but ultimately—and after a dramatic visit by former president Jimmy Carter to Pyongyang—**the U.S**. and several other nations, including the ROK and Japan, **offered energy and economic inducements** in return for Pyongyang’s commitment to dismantle its nuclear program.9 **The policy was widely reviled by leading Republicans**, who nevertheless offered few policy alternatives. Near the end of the Clinton administration Secretary of State Madeleine Albright visited Pyongyang and the administration entertained the idea of a presidential visit if agreement was reached to limit North Korean ballistic missiles. However, time was too short and these hopes went unrealized.10 Newly inaugurated President George W. Bush took a very different course. His administration was widely expected to restart the negotiations begun by the Clinton administration. Indeed, Secretary of State Colin Powell explained his intention “to engage with North Korea [and] pick up where President Clinton left off.”11 However, President Bush rejected that course, publicly embarrassing Secretary Powell. (Also losing face was visiting South Korean President Kim Dae-jung.) President Bush spoke of “loathing” Kim Jong-il and later tagged the DPRK as a member of the “axis of evil,” along with Iraq and Iran. 12 Nevertheless, the administration decided to pursue engagement while broadening the diplomatic agenda from nuclear weapons to include conventional arms control and human rights. However, the revelation of Pyongyang’s uranium enrichment program—an effort originally denied but later admitted by the North—effectively terminated the administration’s diplomatic approach. Both sides unceremoniously buried the Agreed Framework.13 cont….Obama Administration Policy toward North Korea This skepticism informed the incoming Obama administration’s position on the North. In practice, no policy seemed to offer much chance of positive long-run results. While there was evidence that Pyongyang engaged in more provocative behavior when it was not involved in negotiations with the U.S., **neither coercion nor engagement appeared to offer much prospect** of permanently eliminating North Korea’s nuclear program. Whatever the possibility of talking Kim out of his nuclear materials a decade or more prior, that moment had passed. It would naturally be more difficult to convince him to abandon whatever nuclear materials and weapons he had amassed at great expense. Moreover, Kim’s illness, which weakened him physically and politically, and the impending leadership change, suggested that forging a far-reaching settlement, which almost certainly would be opposed by the military, was even less likely. While there were steps short of denuclearization which would promote a more stable and peaceful peninsula—freezing future nuclear production, limiting ballistic missiles, undertaking conventional confidence building measures—the North’s **provocative behavior made them all less achievable**. In fact, three days before Barack Obama’s inauguration the North Korean foreign ministry announced “that we can live without normalizing the relations with the U.S. but not without nuclear deterrent.”15 **Dealing with the DPRK looked to be** a largely **no-win proposition,** guaranteed to be frustrating at best and costly at worst. The **Obama** administration **had numerous domestic priorities. President Obama’s top concern was the economy**, dealing with a painful recession and enacting regulatory reforms in response to the financial crisis. **Moreover, the president and Congress spent roughly a year battling over health care** reform, resulting in passage of this signature legislation. Growing political difficulties resulted in a **Republican takeover of the House** and major Republican gains in the Senate in the 2010 elections, which **further complicated the president’s political task**. As 2011 dawned the lengthy presidential campaign cycle in America was about to begin anew. **There was little likely gain from spending time and effort** on North Korea. Moreover, **the administration faced several** foreign **policy issues which competed for attention with and often appeared to take priority** over dealing with Pyongyang. The president twice increased force levels in Afghanistan, managed a troop drawdown from Iraq, ramped up antiterrorism drone campaigns in Pakistan and Yemen, and intervened militarily in Libya. He initiated a “reset” of relations with Russia16 and engaged China over economic and security issues. Peace between Israel and the Palestinians remained as elusive as ever, while he tightened sanctions and threatened war against Iran over its nuclear program. The economic crisis in Europe had significant foreign policy as well as economic ramifications

**Perceived as weak appeasement – crushes Obama PC and means plan can never be a win**

**Mead, 10** (Walter Russell, Senior Fellow Council Foreign Relations, Prof Foreign affairs @ Bard, 3/31, http://blogs.the-american-interest.com/wrm/2010/03/31/kicked-by-the-great-white-north/

The policy of slapping friends seems not to be working very well; the policy of kissing up to the bad guys has been even less of a success. North Korea, **Cuba, Venezuela** and Iran **have blown off the administration’s efforts to put bilateral relationships on a friendlier basis**. Not only is President Obama back to Bush’s old policy of trying to get the UN to adopt tougher sanctions on Iran, he’s denouncing human rights crackdowns in Cuba. The biggest success to date, getting a new missile treaty with Russia, is at lot less impressive than it looks. Russia needs to reduce the costs of its nuclear arsenal and wants the prestige that comes from arms talks with the US just like the Soviet Union used to have. I support the treaty and hope it gets ratified, but on the whole it’s more a favor from us to Russia than the other way round. In many cases, the administration has good reasons for specific choices that it makes. Russia, for example, is never going to be our best friend, but there is no point in not trying to put relations on a more businesslike basis. Britain’s stand on the Falkland Islands, that there is ‘nothing to negotiate’ where sovereignty is concerned, is a tricky one to support. It always looks bad to be against talks. Given global skepticism about US intentions after the poorly handled war in Iraq, it made sense for the Obama administration to bend over backwards to show it was willing to reach a new relationship with Iran. Pressing Karzai to clean up the abysmal corruption that wastes American money and undermines the strength of his government is certainly the right thing to do. And by twice announcing controversial housing decisions in Jerusalem during critical talks with the United States, the Israeli government was showing enough arrogance or incompetence that the White House had to do something. But while many of steps the administration is taking make sense on their own terms, when you look at them all together the picture isn’t pretty. Beating up on your friends and **kissing up to your enemies looks terrible**, especially when neither your friends nor your enemies show any respect. Slamming Honduras and pampering Russia might have both been good decisions on their own; but when you do them both you end up looking like a hypocrite who moralistically and didactically lectures the weak while fawning on the strong. **Nobody respects that kind of behavior, and nobody admires people who practice it. It tastes weak, like blood in the water — and the sharks out there are paying attention.** The emerging perception of weakness is one reason the administration has had to fight Israel so hard over the Jerusalem issue. As Laura Rozen reports in a must read article at Politico.com, administration sources say that the quarrel with Netanyahu is “bigger than Jerusalem” because “**it’s about the credibility of the administration.”** **It’s precisely because so many people have kicked so much sand in the administration’s face that it had to raise the stakes so high** on this one. **Forcing** Netanyahu to **back down** in Jerusalem **may help the administration fight the perception of weakness abroad, but it is unlikely to help** President **Obama much at home**. And **he may not get the win he seeks**. Canada and Brazil have blown the administration off with no ill effects, and even the preternaturally accommodating Japanese are still defying the administration over the unpopular American military base on Okinawa. If Netanyahu sticks to his guns on an issue where he has strong domestic support, he might still force Washington to compromise. Beating up on our few remaining friends isn’t going to fix things. **What the President really needs is a victory over an adversary. He needs to get** North Korea, Iran, Syria, Hamas, **Venezuela or** even **Cuba to take a step back** — or he needs to charm one of them into behaving more nicely. Capturing bin Laden or otherwise achieving something decisive in Afghanistan would also be a plus. **Failing that, foreign policy will be a continuing weak spot for the administration, and sooner or later that will mean trouble**.

**Accusations of states terrorist ties ensures plan spun as appeasement and costs PC**

**Feffer, 11**

John Feffer is the co-director of Foreign Policy in Focus at the Institute for Policy Studies, October, http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2011/10/2011106104110853664.html

It hasn't worked. North Korea has plunged full speed ahead with its nuclear programme. The US/NATO air campaign against Libya's Muammar Gaddafi, who had given up his nuclear programme to secure better relations with the West, only reinforced Pyongyang's belief that nukes are the ultimate guarantor of its security. **The Obama administration continues to insist that the regime show its seriousness** about denuclearisation as a precondition for resuming talks. Even though **Washington** recently sent a small amount of flood relief, it **refuses to offer any serious** **food assistance**. Indeed, in June, **the House** of Representatives **passed an amendment to the agriculture bill that prohibited all food aid to the country, regardless of need**. Though the administration will likely send envoy Stephen Bosworth to North Korea later this year, **no one expects** major **changes in policy or relations** to result. With a presidential election year already looming, the **Obama** administration **isn't likely to spend political capital** on North Korea - **not when Republicans would undoubtedly label any new moves as "appeasement" of a "terrorist state". Obama came into office with a desire to shift US policy** away from its Middle Eastern focus and reassert the United States' importance as a Pacific power, particularly in light of China's growing regional influence. **But the president has invested more in drones than in diplomacy, sustaining the "War on Terror" at the expense of** the sort of bolder **engagement of adversaries** that Obama hinted at as a candidate. In the meantime, the administration is prepared to just wait it out until the next elections are history - and by then, it might already be too late to catch up with regional developments.

**Appeasement internal – turns public popularity/A2 Obama = Teflon on national security**

**Perception of appeasement undermines obama’s credibility as tough on national security and guts his public approval**

**Carafano, 11**

James Jay Carafano is director of the Allison Center for Foreign Policy Studies at The Heritage Foundation, Daily Caller, 5/9/11

Politico’s Alexander **Burns trumpets** President **Obama’s newly minted reputation as a tough-on-national-security leader**. In “President Obama dashes ‘Jimmy Carter’ label” he notes: “Obama’s overall approval numbers have rallied since May 1, when he announced Bin Laden’s death from the East Room of the White House.” Burns also quotes former Bush administration official Pete Wehner, who “described Bin Laden’s death as a political ‘circuit breaker,’ writing in Commentary magazine: ‘**The specter of Jimmy Carter was beginning to haunt the Obama administration**. For now, at least, that narrative is stopped in its tracks.” Yet, **it is far from clear that getting bin Laden proves Obama has shed his inner** Jimmy **Carter.** The chief goal of the Obama doctrine is to do the minimum to get by in the world — not to do nothing. **Each of his decisions** to send troops into harm’s way, **including the Seal Team Six strike on bin Laden, reflects the president’s minimalist approach** **to the exercise of American power**. I outlined each of these in a post at Family Security Matters. **The bottom line is that when Obama’s foreign policy mirrors conservative foreign policy, his numbers go up.** That should not come as much of a surprise. After all, **most of the nation is center-right and, overwhelmingly, these Americans believe government should zealously uphold its constitutional responsibility to “provide for the common defense.” The problem with Obama’s** consistently **minimalist approach to national security** and the use of force is that it is consistently predictable. That makes it easy for a determined enemy to frustrate. Minimal force and incremental commitments offer the enemy time to adjust. Gaddafi, for one, has shown that. He is still hanging on. At the same time, the clear reluctance to assert U.S. interests have let **leaders in places like** Iran, **Venezuela**, Russia, and China **run circles around the U**nited **S**tates. The president fails when he follows his foreign policy instincts. He succeeds when he ignores them. **To keep his poll numbers up, he will have to adopt a more conservative foreign policy** overall. **For** Barack **Obama to avoid becoming the next Jimmy Carter,** he will need to recognize that what has brought him “success” is bending — and at times abandoning — his own doctrine.

**Sanctions Link – Menendez**

**Any softening of sanctions alienates Menendez – *spillover uniquely likely* and he’s key to agenda – has functional unilateral veto**

**Goodman, 12**

Alana goodman, Editor @ Commentary Magazine, 12/18/12

<http://www.commentarymagazine.com/2012/12/18/menendez-expected-to-take-over-as-foreign-relations-chair/#more-814117>

Finally, some good news to come out of John Kerry’s likely secretary of state appointment: Sen. John Kerry’s (D-Mass.) anticipated move to the State Department would leave the **Senate Foreign Relations Committee in the hands of** Sen. Robert **Menendez** (D-N.J.), **who has consistently bucked the White House on Cuba and Iran.** Menendez is next in line to take over the panel if Sen. Barbara Boxer (D-Calif.) opts to keep her chairmanship of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, as is widely expected. **That would give Menendez a key role** in approving diplomatic nominees and international treaties — **crucial leverage to demand a tougher stance against America’s foes**. **“You can’t work around the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee when he’s willing to dig in his heels on important issues,”** said Roger Noriega, a former assistant secretary of State for Western Hemisphere Affairs under President George W. Bush who’s enthused by Menendez’s possible promotion. “At the same time, **he’s going to be expected to be a team player** — **but that has its limits.** “I think **he’ll give folks in the administration something to think about before they cross him, frankly**.” **When it comes to** Iran **sanctions, it would be difficult to find a stronger Democratic senator than Menendez. He’s been active on the issue for years,** at least since his time on the House international relations committee (now foreign affairs). On the Senate finance committee, he’s joined up with Senator Mark Kirk on several critically important Iran sanctions amendments. But **the White House can’t be thrilled with Menendez’s likely new role. He’s had no reservations about fighting the Obama administration over sanctions,** nor clashing with them over Armenia and Cuba. **The last thing Obama wants is a critic from his own party attacking** his Iran **policy from such a prominent perch** in the Senate.

**Sanctions Link – General**

**Reducing Sanctions once they are already in place requires PC – they’re politically popular**

**Henriksen, 99**

Thomas Henriksen, senior fellow at the Hoover Institution, senior fellow at the U.S. Joint Special Operations University, PhD from Michigan State University, February 1999, Hoover Essays in Public Policy, “Using Power and Diplomacy To Deal With Rogue States,” http://www.hoover.org/publications/epp/2846256.html?show=essay

Even less than watertight restrictions interfere with normal business mechanisms, adding extra costs and economic inefficiencies to the sanctioned country. **That economic coercion can be effective is borne out by the evidence that resentful embargoed countries struggle to have sanctions lifted**, reviling America for imposing them. **They pay fortunes to Washington lobbyists to work the political process to terminate economic pressure.** Yet these targeted regimes at the same time insist that sanctions fail to alter their policies. They complain that U.S. embargoes succeed only in starving children and hurting the poor. **But economic sanctions do damage economies and do morally stigmatize their targets, making them popular instruments in Washington.**

**Sanctions link – A2: business lobby**

**Our link outweighs the turn**

**Losman ‘98**

(Donald L., Professor Economics – National Defense U., Business Economics, April, Lexis)

Intermittent, isolated **protests and lobbying by** individual **businesses,** **who are depicted as "greedy and unprincipled" by sanctions advocates, usually have little impact against the concentrated political power of those seeking to impose the sanctions**. Accordingly, the business community collectively must join together in the hopes that a greater concentration of influence will speak louder. This effort, called USA Engage, has recently been launched.(26)

**A2: Business/Industry Turns – All**

**Makes zero sense – business and industry lobbies obviously already pushing hard for immigration reform and support it no matter what**

**No turns –industry and business backers pocket concessions, won’t push hard or horsetrade, no PC loss from existing regs, public backlash outweighs**

**Steinzor, 12**

Rena Steinzor, CPR President; Professor of Law, University of Maryland Carey School of Law, Huffington Post, 11/7/12, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/rena-steinzor/obama-regulation_b_2088156.html>

President **Obama’s reelection holds the possibility of great progress** for public health, safety, and the environment — if, and **only if, he** recognizes the importance of these issues and **stops trying to placate his most implacable opponents.** The weeks leading up to the election brought powerful reminders of two of the challenges at hand: rising sea levels and more severe storms that scientists say we should expect as a result of unchecked climate change, and a meningitis outbreak that sickened hundreds, thanks to an obscure compounding pharmacy that escaped regulators’ reach. And let’s not forget that we are recovering from an economic downturn in which under-regulation of giant financial institutions played no small part. This is the context, the starting point. Taking a progressive stance on health, safety, and environmental threats has never been easy politically because the industries most affected by these protections have powerful allies in Washington, a small army of lobbyists, and plenty of money to contribute to politicians who support their opposition to regulation. So if the president chooses to take the lead on air and water pollution, food and drug safety, and dangerous conditions in the workplace, for example, he will face extraordinary pressure to do the wrong thing. And, sadly, he did not cover himself with glory during his first term in this area. Particularly as the campaign drew closer, the president tried to burnish his business-friendly credentials at the expense of needed protections. Now he has four more years to leave a legacy of leadership on these vital, life-and-death issues. The stark choices are perhaps best exemplified by climate change. One path is tragically easy, the other extremely hard. The easy path is to only poke at the edges of greenhouse gas emissions reduction. The hard path is to take aggressive action, using the full powers of the Clean Air Act, to put the country on the path to dramatically reduced greenhouse gas emissions. In not so many years, this choice will be looked back on as one of the key measures of the president’s legacy. Without any question, history will condemn inaction in no uncertain terms. But a strong legacy will not depend just on climate. If the president does not act to make government protections stronger and more effective, we will face more tragedies, from fatal foodborne illness to refinery explosions to oil spills that kill people and cost billions. What are some of the first signs we’ll look for to determine which way the president is headed in the second term? Look for who the president appoints to head the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, the little office that has regularly served as a killing ground for rules proposed by federal agencies, in Republican and Democratic administrations alike. The office needs to stop seeing itself as the defender of regulated industries, and the back channel through which politicos in the White House supplant agency expertise with cold, hard politics. The president should appoint an OIRA administrator with a strong background in environmental and health protections, and a record of concern for the public’s interest. The appointee should recognize that the benefits of protecting the public go beyond those that can be simply put in a dollar figure. If the appointee is someone who sees his or her job as tamping down regulatory agencies' determination to protect health, safety and the environment when doing so would inconvenience powerful political interests, we will be heading down the wrong road. Look for who the president appoints to fill cabinet positions, of course. And look to whether the president stops trying to triangulate with Hill Republicans. **The biggest industries** have incredibly savvy **agents in Congress**, and they **are not appeasable**. Sometimes making a deal is the right thing to do. But **attempting to win over the other side with free concessions on policy** or rhetoric **is ineffective.** Note that **most recently, after months hammering the administration for supposedly issuing too many rules, Congressional Republicans abruptly reversed their message, saying** that **the administration was** in fact **not issuing** many **rules, because it was storing them up** for after the election. **Heads I win, tails you lose**. The administration’s regulatory performance in the first term provides some lessons for the second. The first term featured a few notable victories for public protection. For example, the EPA finalized a rule limiting mercury and other toxic pollutants from coal power plants, which will literally save thousands of lives every year and prevent half a million lost work sick days each year. The EPA and NHTSA jointly finalize a fuel economy rule, requiring significant improvements in auto efficiency that will greatly reduce greenhouse gasses and other pollutants (and save consumers money). But I won’t mince words: the administration failed to complete countless rules that it could and should have finished in the first term. An April 2011 CPR White Paper outlined twelve crucial environmental, health and safety rules that the Administration should complete before this fall. Most have not been completed. The final version of a key EPA rule to reduce hazardous air pollutants from industrial boilers has been stalled at the White House since May. The Injury and Illness Prevention Program from OSHA is still somewhere in the works. While some of the rules were stalled in the lead-up to the election, others were blocked or killed much earlier in the administration. The White House famously killed EPA’s ozone rule in the summer of 2011, and relentlessly attacked EPA’s coal ash rule in the first year of the administration, sidelining it by May of 2010. The lesson for the future is that the **pressure on the White House from industry is relentless, no matter the stage** in the electoral cycle. The unfinished rules from the first term provide much of the agenda. The administration needs to finish rules on coal ash, mining safety, food safety, ozone, soot, and backup cameras for cars. It needs to issue its long-stalled chemicals of concern list and get working again on updating the hazardous occupation orders that protect children who work on farms. The list is long and I’m not going to reach the end here. Should these rules be completed, everyone who breathes the air and drinks the water, or who eats food and needs medicine, will reap huge benefits. **Industry lobbyists** will **surely howl** if and **when the administration moves on** these **issues. But** years **after rules are implemented** without causing the sky to fall, **they** will **abandon those fights, and howl about new issues**. Today **there are very, very few examples of an industry making a big push against an existing regulation**. No one thinks we should put lead back in gas or take seatbelts and airbags out of cars. Beyond completing specific rulemakings, the president must turn around his rhetoric on public protections and embrace a positive vision for government. **The Administration’s attempts to adopt anti-regulatory rhetoric failed to appease industry, and will do damage to public opinion if they continue**. The downward rhetorical spiral started in January of 2011, when the president wrote of regulations that are “just plain dumb.” It continued with the president citing a series of examples of supposed bureaucratic buffoonery – each of which turned out to be conservative myths. And it continued with the president saying that regulations “stifle job creation” – a right-wring claim that several of the president’s own top economic advisors had previously disputed. If regulators are such clowns, why should the public support them? The agencies' efforts to implement overwhelmingly popular laws like the Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, the Occupational Safety and Health Act were undercut every time the president repeated these kinds of talking points.

**Turns don’t spill over – cant be placated**

**Steinzor, 11**

Rena Steinzor, CPR President; Professor of Law, University of Maryland Carey School of Law, 8/23/11, <http://www.progressivereform.org/CPRBlog.cfm?idBlog=F87DDA22-0216-0D4F-99EF9C5CB3807670>

The plans themselves, at first look, are largely well-intentioned given the assignment the agencies were given. The EPA plan discusses, for instance, how the internet could be better used to facilitate on-line reporting by polluting plants. In some instances, though, the changes, if done as planned, would have real-life negative consequences: the planned axing of “clearance testing” under EPA’s renovation, repair and painting rule will save money, yes, but run the risk of leaving lead dust behind to poison children when they move back into renovated buildings. The EPA’s final plan dutifully calculates the **cost savings of** its **regulatory changes**, but it all but ignores foregone regulatory benefits, such as these. The **plans won’t placate big business or Republicans in Congress**. Eric **Cantor reliably called them “underwhelming,” while the Chamber of Commerce complained that the administration has made a “ a worthy effort at making** technical **changes** to the regulatory process, **but** the results of this lookback **will not have a material impact** on the real regulatory burdens facing businesses today.” **Give a few inches, and you don’t get anything in return**. So what is the White House doing, then? It’d be one thing to engage in this exercise if the agencies had lots of free time on their hands and there wasn’t anything more important to work on. But that’s not the case. In constant (adjusted for inflation) dollars, agencies like EPA have the same purchasing power that they had in the mid-1980’s. Our current economic situation comes largely thanks to under regulation of financial markets. We’re in an era of “too big to fail,” the BP oil spill, the West Virginia mine collapse and a series of food safety emergencies that hospitalize hundreds or thousands. Agencies have little money to fix these problems, and are about to have even less. Rather than support them in their missions and let them prioritize what needs to be done in terms of the lives saved, public health preserved, and natural resources protected, the Administration diverts money to **pandering to** the **forces that cannot be placated and will never support the President when the chips are down.** The White House has thankfully stepped back from its worst anti-regulatory rhetoric from January. But it does not seem to understand the big-picture situation: under-regulation is the problem of the day, and the agencies need help, not the unfunded mandate that is regulatory look-back. Meanwhile, OMB recently asked the agencies to prepare for 5 or 10 percent budget cuts. The full reviews of existing rules will be time-consuming to do, and it’s troubling that OIRA, supposedly the kings and queens of cost-benefit analysis, doesn’t seem to care this time about trade-offs—that is, what the agencies won’t get done while they are doing these plans. Meanwhile, the latest regulatory agendas from the agencies, from July, show more delays. These are not agencies with free time on their hands. It’s unhelpful for the White House to flatly state, over and over again, that the agencies will simply get the look-back done with no other work lost. The White House touts the transparency of the look-back process, and they are opening the rule changes to public comment. Transparency in rulemaking shouldn’t be an optional thing that you implement when you like, though. OMB recently held a worker safety rule, for young workers in grain elevators, for nine months. After getting bad press, OMB is apparently releasing the rule. Will OMB release the original version of the rule from the Department of Labor, so the public can see what was changed? This is the transparency that’s needed – transparency that may not make you always look good. Ironically, this look-back process will make strict new rules harder to adopt – because the clear message to agencies from the White House is to back off, and because the look-back uses their resources. But **the White House won’t get political credit** for that **from their target audience – just disappointment from progressives**, disappointed at the whole exercise.

### Trade

#### Increasing trade is a partisan issue

Raum 6-15 (John, writer for AP, “Obama's dilemma: Scant support from Democrats for trade liberalization,” <http://bigstory.ap.org/article/obama-trade-dilemma-scant-support-democrats>, ME)

President Barack Obama is aggressively pushing an ambitious agenda to liberalise global trading.¶ But already political trade wars are forming, and they're with fellow Democrats rather than with Republicans, his usual antagonists.¶ Obama is promoting free-trade proposals with Europe and Asia that could affect up to two-thirds of all global trade.¶ The ambitious deals would reduce or eliminate tariffs and other trade barriers. But there is trouble ahead for both the Trans-Pacific Partnership and the Trans-Atlantic Trade and Investment Partnership â€¦ at the negotiating table and from Congress.¶ The deal with Europe will be a top item this week in Northern Ireland at the Group of Eight summit of major industrial countries.¶ The Asia pact was brought up pointedly by the new Chinese president, Xi Jinping, in his California meetings with Obama recently.¶ Republicans historically have supported free-trade agreements far more than have Democrats, and a politically weakened Obama may not have enough second-term clout to successfully twist the arms of enough Democratic lawmakers.¶ Some Republicans who usually vote for easing trade barriers may vote "no" just because the agreements will bear Obama's signature.¶ Both deals generally have the support of US businesses. But labour unions and human rights and environmental groups, core Democratic constituencies, have so far viewed them cynically.¶ These organisations and Democrats in general, say that free-trade deals can cost American jobs and lead to environmental and workplace abuses that would not be tolerated in the US.¶ "We certainly have concerns," said Celeste Drake, a trade and policy specialist at the AFL-CIO, the nation's largest labour federation. "I think Obama realises this problem about Republicans always being the big supporters [of trade liberalisation] and he would like to have our support. But overall we're sceptical. We wish we'd see more."¶ It's not a new problem.¶ President Bill Clinton powered the US-Mexico-Canada North American Free-Trade Agreement through Congress in 1993 only by heavily courting Republicans and overcoming stiff Democratic opposition,

**Drug Policy**

**Perception of changing latin American drug policy drains PC necessary for immigration reform**

**Hakim et al, 12**

Peter Hakim, Andrés Rozental, Rubens Barbosa, Riordan Roett, Ruben Olmos

Inter-American Dialogue’s Latin America Advisor, Peter Hakim is president emeritus and senior fellow of the Inter-American Dialogue, a Washington-based think tank on Western Hemisphere affairs. He served as president of the Dialogue from 1993 to 2010, writes and speaks widely on hemispheric issues, and has testified more than a dozen times before Congress. His articles have appeared in Foreign Affairs, Foreign Policy, The New York Times, The Washington Post, Miami Herald, Los Angeles Times, and Financial Times, and in newspapers and journals in Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Mexico, Peru, and other Latin American nations. He is a regular guest on CNN, BBC, CBS, CNN en Español and other prominent news stations around the world. He wrote a monthly column for the Christian Science Monitor for nearly ten years, and now serves as a board member of Foreign Affairs Latinoamerica and editorial advisor to Americaeconomia, where he also publishes a regular column11/8/12 http://www.thedialogue.org/page.cfm?pageID=32&pubID=3135

What Will Obama's Second Term Mean **for Latin America**? Q: Barack Obama was re-elected president of the United States on Tuesday. What is his vision for foreign policy and how does Latin America fit into his plans? How will Latin American leaders and their citizens react to the election results? **What** role did Latinos in the United States play in **the election** and what does that **mean for U.S. policy changes on** issues such as immigration, **drugs** and Cuba? A: Peter Hakim, member of the Advisor board and president emeritus of the Inter-American Dialogue: "Any speculation about Obama's second term has to come mainly from his first-term performance. The campaign was about the candidates and their biographies—not about issues. **Nothing suggests Congress will be** more **productive. The House remains** virtually **unchanged. The Senate will be more divisive** still as most remaining moderate Republicans and Democrats resigned or lost their seats. We will know soon whether compromise is possible when the lame-duck Congress returns next week, and begins discussion of the fiscal cliff embroglio. The best guess is that Congress will find a way, not to resolve the problem, but to defer its consequences. The election results focused attention on immigration policy, which both Republicans and Democrats may be motivated to address. President Obama's declared intention to address immigration was surely reinforced by the huge Latino vote. Many of the Republicans who blocked previous immigration initiatives will resist again. But some recognize their party may become irrelevant unless they take seriously the Latino and black constituencies that accounted for more than 40 percent of Obama's total. U.S. immigration reform would be a welcome change in most of Latin America, particularly in Mexico, Central America and the Caribbean. Obama may seek to pursue further openings to Cuba—but these will be limited unless the Cuban government shows a willingness to reciprocate with new human rights measures or political changes. **Drug policy is not high on the U.S. agenda**, but the approval in Colorado and Washington of ballot initiatives to legalize marijuana use may spark wider discussion on drug issues. But Mitt Romney offered the most significant policy proposal for Latin America, when called for more intensive U.S. efforts to pursue multiplying economic opportunities in the region." A: Andrés Rozental, member of the Advisor board, president of Rozental & Asociados in Mexico City and senior fellow at the Brookings Institution: "President Obama's re-election is a welcome development for Latin Americans in general, and Mexicans in particular. Although many of Obama's campaign promises in 2008 relevant to the region remain unrealized, there is a modicum of hope that as a leader in his second term, **with more political capital to spend, he can** at least **make a stronger effort to tackle comprehensive immigration reform** and trade issues critical to Latin American prosperity. **Although I don't foresee any major change in** the **U**nited **S**tates' foreign **policy toward the region, especially as long as Afghanistan, Iran and the Middle East remain priorities for Washington**, that may not necessarily be a bad thing. We often complain when Washington pays too much attention to us, and equally when there's less overt interest in the region, but I believe that Obama has mostly shown a much more mature attitude toward Latin America over the last four years than has traditionally been the case. This will hopefully also be the case as his administration continues through 2016. Presumably, there will continue to be a strong focus on completing ongoing trade negotiations, especially the Trans-Pacific Partnership, to open new opportunities for economic growth and hopefully a re-visiting of NAFTA as a key option to make North America more competitive on the global scene. Latinos played a key role in re-electing Obama, just as they did in 2008, and the one message that Republicans have to take home at this stage is that the anti-immigrant, exclusionary policies voiced during the campaign by Mitt Romney, the Tea Party and other conservatives were a key factor in their ultimate defeat. Many of Obama's liberal views on minority rights and tolerance turned out to be much more popular among Americans as a whole than the opposing Republican positions on those same issues." A: Rubens Barbosa, former ambassador of Brazil to the United States: "In his second term, Obama will be more interested in looking for his legacy in history. The U.S. government will tend to be more proactive and try to increase its influence in the current hot spots: Pakistan, Syria, Iran and elsewhere in the Middle East. The relationship with China will continue to be high on the foreign policy agenda. Having in mind this scenario, **Latin America will continue to be off the radar of U.S. decision makers: the region will remain a low priority for Washington.** Despite this fact, the reaction of the Latin American leaders and citizens to Obama's re-election has been very positive. The role of Latinos in the election was important and in some places crucial. **In terms of policy changes on** issues such as immigration, **drugs** and Cuba, **Obama will continue to face strong opposition from the Republican Party** but I would not be surprised if new ideas could be advanced by the administration especially in relation to immigration and Cuba." A: Riordan Roett, director of the Latin American Studies program at the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies: "While the president's re-election is welcome in general terms**, it is difficult to imagine Latin America will receive greater attention** in the next four years. **Congress remains deeply divided**. The administration's foreign policy priorities will continue to focus on China, the Middle East and the ongoing fiscal challenges. Given the strong turnout by the Latino community, **one area that should receive priority is** continued **immigration reform**, but it is the third rail for the Republican majority in the House. In general, the democratic governments of the region will welcome the president's election without great expectation for major policy initiatives. The populist regimes will continue to denounce any democratically elected administration. The deadlock over Cuba will continue unless there is a dramatic leadership shift to a new generation. The **major policy initiative** that would be welcome in the region is **on drug policy**, but that issue **will remain taboo**."

## Links – Cuba

**1NC Link\*\*\***

**Drains capital – Backlash and hostage taking on unrelated priority legislation is empirically proven, likely in future and specifically true for Rubio – Cuba policy is totally unique – this is the best link card you will ever read**

**LeoGrande, 12**

William M. LeoGrande School of Public Affairs American University, Professor of Government and a specialist in Latin American politics and U.S. foreign policy toward Latin America, Professor LeoGrande has been a frequent adviser to government and private sector agencies, 12/18/12, http://www.american.edu/clals/upload/LeoGrande-Fresh-Start.pdf

The Second Obama Administration Where in the executive branch will control over Cuba policy lie? **Political considerations played a major role in Obama's Cuba policy during the first term**, albeit not as preeminent a consideration as they were during the Clinton years. In 2009, **Obama's** new foreign policy **team** got off to a bad start when they **promised Senator Menendez that they would consult him before changing Cuba policy. That was the price he extracted for providing Senate Democrats with the 60 votes needed to break a Republican filibuster on a must-pass omnibus appropriations bill to keep the government operating. For the next four years, administration officials worked more closely with Menendez, who opposed** the sort of major **redirection of policy** Obama had promised, **than they did with senators** like John Kerry (D-Mass.), chair of the Foreign Relations Committee, **whose views were more in line** with the president's stated policy goals. **At the Department of State**, Assistant Secretary Arturo Valenzuela **favored initiatives to improve relations with Cuba**, but he **was stymied by indifference or resistance elsewhere in the bureaucracy**. Secretary Hillary Clinton, having staked out a tough position Cuba during the Democratic primary campaign, was **not inclined to be the driver for a new policy**. At the NSC, Senior Director for the Western Hemisphere Dan Restrepo, who advised **Obama** on **Latin America policy** during the 2008 campaign, **did his best to avoid the Cuba issue because it was so fraught with political danger. When the president finally approved** the resumption of people-to-people **travel** to Cuba, which Valenzuela had been pushing, **the White House political team delayed the announcement for several months at the behest of** Debbie Wasserman **Schultz. Any easing of** the travel **regulations**, she warned, **would hurt Democrats' prospects in the** upcoming **mid-term** elections.43 **The White House shelved the new regulations** until January 2011, and then announced them late Friday before a holiday weekend. **Then, just a year later, the administration surrendered to** Senator **Rubio's demand** that it limit the licensing of travel providers **in exchange for him dropping his hold on the appointment** of Valenzuela's replacement.44 With Obama in his final term and Vice-President Joe Biden unlikely to seek the Democratic nomination in 2016 (unlike the situation Clinton and Gore faced in their second term), politics will presumably play a less central role in deciding Cuba policy over the next four years. **There will still be the temptation**, however, **to sacrifice Cuba policy to mollify congressional conservatives, both Democrat and Republican, who are willing to hold other Obama initiatives hostage to extract concessions on Cuba**. **And since Obama has given in to such hostage-taking previously, the hostage-takers have a strong incentive to try the same tactic again.** The only way to break this cycle would be for the president to stand up to them and refuse to give in, as he did when they attempted to rollback his 2009 relaxation of restrictions on CubanAmerican travel and remittances. Much will depend on who makes up Obama's new foreign policy team, especially at the **Department of State**. John Kerry has been a strong advocate of a more open policy toward Cuba, and worked behind the scenes with the State Department **and USAID** to clean up the "democracy promotion" program targeting Cuba, as a way to win the release of Alan Gross. A new secretary is likely to bring new assistant secretaries, providing an opportunity to revitalize the **Bureau of Western Hemisphere Affairs,** which **has been thoroughly cowed by congressional hardliners**. But **even with new players in place, does Cuba rise to the level of importance that would justify a major new initiative and the bruising battle with conservatives on the Hill?** Major **policy changes that require a significant expenditure of political capital rarely happen unless the urgency of the problem forces policymakers to take action.**

### 2NC Link

#### Plan is massively controversial

Sullivan 12 – Coordinator, Specialist in Latin America Affairs, (Mark P, “Latin America and the Caribbean: ¶ U.S. Policy and Key Issues for Congress ¶ in 2012”, Feb 14, <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R42360.pdf>, CMR)

As in the previous Congress, legislative and oversight attention to Latin America and the ¶ Caribbean during the 112th Congress is focusing on the continued increase in drug traffickingrelated violence in Mexico and U.S. assistance to Mexico under the Mérida Initiative; efforts to ¶ help Central American and Caribbean countries contend with drug trafficking and violent crime; ¶ as well as continued counternarcotics and security support to Colombia, which still faces threats ¶ from armed actors. The earthquake that devastated Port-au-Prince in January 2010, combined ¶ with a cholera outbreak in the fall of 2010, has continued to focus congressional attention on the ¶ enormous task of disaster recovery and reconstruction in Haiti. As in past years, debate over U.S. ¶ sanctions on Cuba, particularly restrictions on travel and remittances, has remained a contentious ¶ issue with ongoing congressional debate over how to support change in one of the world’s last ¶ remaining communist nations. Latin American nations, especially Mexico, which remains the ¶ leading source country of both legal permanent residents and unauthorized immigrants in the ¶ United States, have been disappointed by what they see as a lack of effort in Congress on ¶ comprehensive immigration reform

#### Plan is a massive gamble – drains political capital

Piccone 3/18/13 – Senior Fellow and Deputy Director, Foreign Policy (Ted, “Time to Bet on Cuba”, <http://www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2013/03/18-cuba-piccone>, CMR)

Cuba’s efforts to “update” its socialist system through a series of economic reforms just got more complicated. The death of Venezuela’s Hugo Chávez, its principal benefactor, could seriously disrupt what is already a precarious process of maintaining top-down political control while liberalizing elements of the economy. Raúl Castro’s announcement that he will step down in five years and the emergence of younger leaders born after the 1959 revolution add further uncertainty to the island’s future.¶ These new circumstances offer President Obama a rare opportunity to turn the page of history from an outdated Cold War approach to Cuba to a new era of constructive engagement. In his second term in office, he should place a big bet by investing political capital in defrosting relations, an approach that will advance U.S. interests in a stable, prosperous and democratic Cuba.

#### Plan causes huge fights and drains political capital

Padgett 10 (Tim, “Will the White House Fight to End the Cuba Travel Ban?”, Aug 23, <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,2013820,00.html#ixzz2TTN7a100>, CMR)

Proponents of doing just that insist there's more consensus than ever in the U.S. to ditch the Cuba embargo and its travel ban, which, after almost 50 years, have utterly failed to dislodge the Castro regime. Opening Cuba to Americans, they believe, will do more to stimulate democratization there than isolating it has. Even a majority of Cuban Americans now agree.¶ Still, for all the good vibes the bill's backers feel from the White House right now, some note warily that Obama has been loath to spend political capital in Cuba, or the rest of Latin America for that matter. Critics, for example, point to his decision last year to stop applying pressure against coup leaders in Honduras, who'd ousted a leftist President, when conservative Republicans in Congress objected.¶ Embargo supporters, including Cuban-American Senator Robert Menendez of New Jersey, a Democrat, are already blasting Obama's plans to relax Cuba travel. "This is not the time to ease the pressure on the Castro regime," Menendez said this month, insisting it will only give the brothers "a much needed infusion of dollars that will only extend their reign of oppression." As a result, says one congressional aide who asked not to be identified, when it comes time for the White House to give the bill more full-throated support, "there's a fear they may just decide that the fight's not worth it."

#### Expanded engagement with Cuba drains political capital

Lobe 8 (Jim, “Obama to Seek Global Re-engagement, But How Much?”, 11-5-2008, <http://ipsnorthamerica.net/news.php?idnews=1823>, CMR)

On the one hand, Obama has repeatedly stressed the importance of multilateralism and diplomatic re-engagement with the world, including long-time U.S. adversaries such as Iran, Cuba, and North Korea, as a contrast to the unilateralist and militarised approach of the incumbent, President George W. Bush.¶ On the other hand, most of his advisers are veterans of the administration of President Bill Clinton whose own brand of liberal interventionism -- including the circumvention of the United Nations in the Balkans, Sudan, and Iraq and reluctance to press Israel to make key concessions in negotiations with its Arab neighbours -- and notion that the U.S. was the 'indispensable nation' helped lay the foundation for the eight years that followed.¶ 'There are lots of Clinton re-treads,' noted Stephen Clemons, who heads the American Strategy Programme at the New America Foundation (NAF). He pointed to the reported offer to Rep. Rahm Emanuel, a former senior Clinton aide, to serve as Obama's White House Chief of Staff as one of many hints that a 'Clinton-3' administration may be in the offing.¶ As the biracial son of a Kenyan father, who spent a formative part of his childhood in Indonesia and the rest in multi-cultural Hawaii, Obama will clearly present a far different image of the United States to the rest of the world than his immediate predecessor, or any other, for that matter. Aside from his background and physical appearance, his eloquence, equanimity under fire, and intellectual acuity and curiosity will also mark a striking contrast to Bush.¶ 'The fact that he presents a very different face of America is very important, because our political capital around the world has been so very badly depleted over the last eight years,' according to Raj Menon, who teaches international relations at Lehigh University.¶ But that image, as well the foreign policy commitments he made during the campaign -- assuming that he holds to them -- may not be sufficient to ensure the kind of sweeping change in course that much of the world and many voters who cast their ballots for him here expect.¶ Obama will almost certainly make good within a relatively short time on his promises to close the Guantanamo detention facility, rejoin global efforts to curb greenhouse gas emissions responsible for global warming, and open direct dialogues with Syria and Iran, that will cheer Democrats and Washington's European allies. ¶ But, despite Democratic gains in Congress, he may be less inclined to expend political capital on more controversial issues that will require substantial bipartisan support, such as ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty or the Rome Protocol for the International Criminal Court and amending the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) to strengthen labour rights and environmental provisions.

#### Republicans hate the plan- see it as caving to the regime

Taylor 6/18 (Guy, The Washington Times in 2011 as the State Department correspondent, “U.S.-Cuba mail talks spark speculation of wider outreach,” <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2013/jun/18/us-cuba-mail-talks-spark-speculation-wider-outreac/>, ME)

Rep. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Florida Republican, said that the White House is caving to pressure from Cuban leaders desperate to end trade restrictions frozen since the 1960s.¶ “The regime is once again manipulating the U.S. administration in this game because it wants us to lift the embargo and make further concessions,” said Mrs. Ros-Lehtinen, a former chairwoman of the House Foreign Relations Committee and a staunch opponent of easing the stand-off that has defined bilateral relations since Cuban leader Fidel Castro agreed to house Soviet ballistic missiles in 1961.

**General Link - Yes Spillover UNRELATED legislation\*\***

**Costs Capital, outweighs turns and ensures spillover derailing Obamas top UNRELATED agenda priorities – several reasons**

**LeoGrande, 12**

William M. LeoGrande School of Public Affairs American University, Professor of Government and a specialist in Latin American politics and U.S. foreign policy toward Latin America, Professor LeoGrande has been a frequent adviser to government and private sector agencies, 12/18/12, http://www.american.edu/clals/upload/LeoGrande-Fresh-Start.pdf

**The Republicans'** sweeping **victory in the** 2010 mid-term **elections put the House back under their control and ended any hope of a progressive initiative on Cuba coming from Congress**. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen became chair of **the House Foreign Affairs Committee**, a post from which she **could hold Obama's foreign policy hostage over the issue of Cuba.** Mario Diaz Balart introduced legislation to roll back Obama's 2009 relaxation of restrictions on CubanAmerican travel and remittances, but it was dropped when President Obama threatened a veto.39 Tea Party darling Marco **Rubio** was elected to the Senate from Florida in 2010, and **joined the Foreign Relations Committee**. In 2011, **he put a hold on Obama's nominee** for Assistant Secretary of State for Western Hemisphere Affairs **until the administration promised to tighten regulations on** academic and educational **travel that Obama had authorized** in January. 40 Although the Democrats made significant gains in both the House and **Senate in 2012, Republicans retained control of the House and enough votes in the Senate to block any measure by filibuster.** Nevertheless, the election produced some important personnel changes that could have a bearing on Cuba policy. In the House, Ros-Lehtinen will step down as chair of the **Foreign Affairs Committee** because of Republican rules on term limits for chairs. Her likely replacement is Ed Royce (R-Calif), who criticized Obama in 2009 for turning off the electronic billboard on the U.S. Interests Section in Havana, but who has not been especially engaged in the debate over Cuba policy otherwise. Howard Berman (D-Calif), who had been the **ranking Democrat** on the Committee and a vocal critic of U.S. democracy promotion programs in Cuba, lost his bid for reelection. His successor as ranking member, Eliot Engel (D-NY), was ranking member of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee in the previous Congress. In recent years, **Engel has voted consistently against** Democrats' **attempts to ease restrictions on travel and food sales to Cuba, and the U.S.-Cuba Democracy PAC has been among his top 20 campaign contributors** since the 2008 election cycle. **In short**, although the exact composition of **the Foreign Affairs Committee** is in flux, **it seems clear that conservative Republicans and Democrats together will retain a sufficient majority to block any progressive initiatives on Cuba emerging from the committee**. David Rivera (R-Fl.), one of the most extreme anti-Cuban voices in the House, was defeated by Joe Garcia, a moderate Cuban-American who defended Obama's Cuba policy. Jeff Flake (R-Ariz), a perennial voice for opening up to Cuba, traded his House seat for one in the Senate. In the Senate, Tea Party favorite Ted Cruz, won a seat from Texas. Although his father came from Cuba in 1957, Cruz did not identify himself as Latino or show any special interest in Latino issues or in Cuba. **Democratic gains in the Senate did not produce a filibuster-proof majority, and the determined opposition of Rubio and Menendez will probably be sufficient to prevent any progressive legislation on Cuba from making it through the Senate. Most likely, the next four years will reprise the last two, with conservatives fighting a legislative guerrilla war against Obama's Cuba policy by holding up nominations and threatening to filibuster must-pass legislation in an effort to brow-beat the administration into policy concessions. If there are to be any new initiatives on Cuba, they will have to come from the White House**. Despite HelmsBurton's constraints, the president retains substantial executive authority to selectively loosen the embargo for both commerce and travel.42

**Drains capital and empirically spills over to UNRELATED legislation**

**Swanson, 9** (Ian, News Editor @ The Hill, The Hill, 4/10, http://thehill.com/homenews/news/19161-obama-to-lift-some-restrictions-on-cuba

Advocates on both sides of the debate over Cuba expect Obama to lift rules preventing Cuban-Americans from visiting relatives on the island. The rules were imposed by Bush's administration and are unpopular with many Cuban-Americans. Obama is also expected to allow Cuban-Americans to send remittances to family members in Cuba, which would end another unpopular restriction imposed by Bush. Obama is also expected to allow U.S. citizens to travel to Cuba for cultural, academic and humanitarian purposes, which would effectively return policies to the status at the end of the Clinton administration. The Cuban American National Foundation, a Miami-based dissident group that supports a trade embargo with Cuba, announced its support this week for allowing cultural visits. The changes would leave the trade embargo in place, as well as restrictions meant to prevent U.S. citizens from going to Cuba as tourists. Some **supporters of a more open relationship with Cuba** had **feared the administration might back away from loosening rules** to allow cultural, academic and humanitarian trips **out of fear the steps might force Obama to spend political capital with powerful lawmakers who support a hard line with Cuba, such as Sen**. Robert **Menendez** (D-N.J.), **who heads the Senate Democrats’ campaign arm**. **These sources said administration officials were annoyed that conflicts over Cuba policy complicated efforts to move the omnibus spending bill last month**.

**General Link - Yes Spillover**

**Increasing Cuban Engagement requires PC – spills over derailing Obamas top congressional priorities**

**Kupchan, 10** (Charles A. Kupchan, professor of International Affairs at Georgetown University and a Senior Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, Mar/Apr 2010, “Enemies Into Friends”, Foreign Affairs, Proquest)

I**F THE Obama administrations** tentative **engagement** **with** the United States' **rivals** **is to be more than a passing flirtation, Washington will have to conduct** not only deft statecraft abroad but also **particularly savvy politics at home**. **Progress will be slow and incremental**; it takes years, if not decades, to turn enmity into amity. **The problem for Obama is that patience is in extraordinarily short supply in Washington**. With midterm elections looming in November, **critics will surely intensify** their **claims that Obama's outreach has yet to pay off. In preparation, Obama should push particularly hard** on a single front, aiming to have at least one clear example that his strategy is working. Rapprochement with Russia arguably offers the best prospects for near-term success. Washington and Moscow are well on their way toward closing a deal on arms control, and their interests intersect on a number of other important issues, including the need for stability in Central and South Asia. Moreover, the United States can piggyback on the progress that the European Union has already made in reaching out to Russia on issues of trade, energy, and security. **Obama** also **needs to start laying the groundwork for congressional support. To help clear the legislative hurdles** ahead, Obama should consider including in his stable of special envoys a prominent Republican - such as former National Security Adviser Brent Scowcroft, former Senator Chuck Hagel, or former Secretary of State James Baker - to lend a bipartisan imprimatur to any proposed deals that might come before Congress. **He must** also **be careful not to overreach**. For example, his call to eliminate nuclear weapons altogether, however laudable in theory, may scare off centrist senators who might otherwise be prepared to ratify the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. **Obama should** also **be mindful of the order in which he picks his fights**. If advancing rapprochement with Russia is a priority for 2010, **it makes sense to put off heavy lifting with Cuba** until the following year. **It is better to shepherd a few key items through Congress than to ask for too much - and risk coming back empty-handed. Despite** the **numerous obstacles at home** and abroad, the **Obama** administration should stick to its **strategy of engaging U.S. adversaries**. Rapprochement usually takes place in fits and starts and, under the best of circumstances, **requires painstaking diplomacy and persistence**. But when it works, it makes the world a much safer place. That realization alone should help buy Obama at least some of the time that he will need if he is to succeed in turning enemies into friends.

**Drains Finite PC and derails more important agenda priorities – powerful cuba lobby, congressional opposition and Gross imprisonment issue block**

**Williams, 13**

Carol J. Williams, Los Angeles Times international affairs writer. Former foreign correspondent, 25 years covering Europe, Latin America, Asia and the Middle East, 5/3/13, <http://www.democracyinamericas.org/blog-post/la-times-political-calculus-keeps-cuba-on-u-s-list-of-terror-sponsors/>

LA Times: **Political calculus keeps Cuba on U.S. list of terror sponsors** – Cuba’s communist leadership was quick to send condolences to the victims of the Boston Marathon bombings and to reiterate to Washington that it “rejects and condemns unequivocally all acts of terrorism.” Once a key supplier of arms and training to leftist rebels in Latin America, the Castro regime long ago disentangled itself from the Cold War-era confrontations. Havana now hosts peace talks between the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia that it once supported and the U.S.-allied government the insurgents battled for years. Havana still gives refuge to a few fugitive radicals from the Black Panthers and Basque insurgents, and two years ago a Cuban court convicted 64-year-old development specialist Alan Gross on spying charges for attempting to install satellite equipment without government permission. But nothing that Cuba has done suggests its government is plotting harm against Americans, national security experts say. And they criticize as counterproductive the State Department’s decision, disclosed this week, to keep Cuba on its list of “state sponsors of terrorism.” “We ought to reserve that term for nations that actually use the apparatus of statehood to support the targeting of U.S. interests and civilians,” said Juliette Kayyem, a former assistant secretary for intergovernmental affairs at the Department of Homeland Security and now writing and lecturing on national security in the Boston area. “Yes, Cuba does a lot of bad things that we don’t like, but it doesn’t rise to anything on the level of a terrorist threat.” On Wednesday, State Department spokesman Patrick Ventrell said the administration “has no current plans to remove Cuba” from the list to be released later this month. The island nation that has been under a U.S. trade and travel embargo since shortly after revolutionary leader Fidel Castro came to power in 1959 is in the company of only Iran, Syria and Sudan in being branded with the “state sponsor” label. Kayyem laments the “diluting” of the terrorist designation based on political or ideological disputes. “We work with a lot of countries we don’t like, but the imprimatur of ‘terrorism’ has a ring to it in a way that can be harmful to us,” she said. Collaboration between the United States and Cuba on emergency planning to respond to the mutual threats posed by hurricanes, oil spills and refugee crises are complicated by the set of trade and financial restrictions that comes along with the “state sponsor” censure, Kayyem said. “There are some real operational impediments when we have a system that begins with ‘no’ rather than ‘why not?’ ” she said of the legally encumbered contacts between Havana and Washington. **Politicians who have pushed for a continued hard line against Cuba cheered their victory in getting the Obama administration to keep Cuba on the list. U.S. Rep**. Ileana **Ros-Lehtinen**, a South Florida Republican **whose efforts to isolate and punish the Castro regime have been a central plank of her election strateg**y throughout her 24 years in Congress, **hailed the** State Department d**ecision** as “reaffirming the threat that the Castro regime represents.” Arash **Aramesh**, a national security analyst **at Stanford** Law School, **blamed the continued branding of Cuba as a terrorism sponsor on politicians “pandering for a certain political base**.” He also said President **Obama** and Secretary of State John F. Kerry have **failed to make a priority of removing the impediment to better relations with Cuba.** “As much as I’d like to see the Castro regime gone and an open and free Cuba, it takes away from the State Department’s credibility when they include countries on the list that aren’t even close” to threatening Americans, Aramesh said. Political considerations also factor into excluding countries from the “state sponsor” list, he said, pointing to Pakistan as a prime example. Although Islamabad “very clearly supports terrorist and insurgent organizations,” he said, the U.S. government has long refused to provoke its ally in the region with the official censure. The decision to retain Cuba on the list surprised some observers of the long-contentious relationship between Havana and Washington. Since Fidel Castro retired five years ago and handed the reins of power to his younger brother, Raul, modest economic reforms have been tackled and the government has revoked the practice of requiring Cubans to get “exit visas” before they could leave their country for foreign travel. There was talk early in Obama’s first term of easing the 51-year-old embargo, and Kerry, though still in the Senate then, wrote a commentary for the Tampa Bay Tribune in 2009 in which he deemed the security threat from Cuba “a faint shadow.” He called then for freer travel between the two countries and an end to the U.S. policy of isolating Cuba “that has manifestly failed for nearly 50 years.” **The political clout of the Cuban American community** in South Florida **and more recently** Havana’s **refusal to release Gross have kept any warming between the** Cold War **adversaries at bay.** **It’s a matter of political priorities and trade-offs,** Aramesh said. He noted that former Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton last year exercised her discretion to get the Iranian opposition group Mujahedeen Khalq, or MEK, removed from the government’s list of designated terrorist organizations. That move was motivated by the hopes of some in Congress that the group could be aided and encouraged to eventually challenge the Tehran regime. **“It’s a question of how much political cost you want to incur or how much political capital you want to spend,”** Aramesh said. “President **Obama has decided not to reach out to Cuba, that he has more important** foreign **policy battles elsewhere.”**

**spun as appeasement – triggers intense fight and derails Obama domestic agenda priorities**

**Dueck, 11**

Colin Dueck,professor at the Department of Public and International Affairs, George Mason University, October 1, 2011

policy review » no. 169, <http://www.hoover.org/publications/policy-review/article/94006>

Look at how **Obama’s strategy of accommodation has played out in relation to** four categories of foreign governments: 1) those essentially hostile to the United States, 2) those who pursue a mixture of strategic rivalry and cooperation, 3) genuine American allies, and 4) Arab governments of varying allegiance. The first category, of **regimes** basically **hostile to the U**nited **S**tates**, includes** the governments of Iran, North Korea, **Cuba, and Venezuela, to name** only four of **the most notable**. Each of **these governments has literally defined itself at a fundamental level by violent opposition to America**. To think that a conciliatory tone, a preliminary concession, or a well-intentioned desire for better relations on the part of a U.S. president by itself will transform that hostility is simply naïve. In the case of Cuba, for example, the Obama administration began by lifting certain economic sanctions, in the hope of seeing some reciprocal concessions from the Castro brothers: political liberalization, an easing of anti-American hostility, anything at all of significance. No such concessions have been made. The case of Iran has already been discussed — Obama reached out to Tehran with great fanfare in 2009, and has received in effect a slap in the face. Both Venezuela’s Hugo Chavez and North Korea’s Kim Jong Il are likewise just as hostile and provocative toward the United States today as they were when George W. Bush was America’s president. This is because the fundamental barrier to friendly U.S. relations with those regimes was never George W. Bush. The fundamental barrier to friendly relations with these regimes is the fact that they are bitterly hostile to the United States. The kinds of **concessions** that Washington would have to offer to win their genuine **accommodation would be** so sweeping, massive, and **unacceptable, from the point of view of any likely U.S. president that they will not be made — and certainly not by** Barack **Obama**. Any smaller concessions from Washington, therefore, are simply pocketed by a hostile regime, which continues along in its basic antipathy toward the United States. So who is supposed to be the target audience here? The true audience and for that matter the ultimate source of these various conciliatory policy initiatives is essentially a small, transnational, North Atlantic class of bien pensant opinion who already share Obama’s core policy priorities in any case. They have rewarded him with their support, as well as with the Nobel Peace Prize. Others internationally are less impressed. And in the meantime, we may have lost something, in terms of the ability to seriously prepare for certain looming security challenges. A primary and continuing emphasis on diplomatic engagement after Iran has repeatedly rebuffed the United States does not help us to prepare for the possibility of a nuclear-armed Iran. A declared commitment to nuclear abolition does nothing to convince other nuclear powers to abandon their own arsenals, and may even be counterproductive in the sense that it deludes important segments of opinion into believing that such declarations actually help to keep the peace. Obama has said from the beginning that the purpose of his more conciliatory foreign policy approach was to bolster American standing in the world, but the definition of international standing has actually been highly self-referential in the direction of aforementioned transatlantic liberal opinion. In many cases overseas, from the perspective of other governments, Obama’s well-intentioned **conciliatory gestures are read as a sign of weakness**, and consequently undermine rather than bolster American standing. In one way, however, **Obama** has already achieved much of what he desired with his **strategy** of accommodation, and that **is to re-orient American** national resources and **attention away from national security concerns and toward** the expansion of **domestic progressive reforms**. He appears to sincerely believe that these liberal domestic initiatives in areas such as health care and finance will also bolster American economic power and competiveness. Actually they will do no such thing, since heavy-handed and constantly changing federal regulations tend to undermine investor confidence as well as long-term U.S. economic growth. But either way, **Obama’s vision of** a more expansive government role in **American society is well on its way to being achieved, without** from his point of view **debilitating debates over major national security concerns**. **In that sense,** especially **if he is reelected** in 2012, several of his **major strategic priorities will have been accomplished**. Any **good strategy must incorporate the possibility of pushback or resistance** from unexpected quarters. As they say in the U.S. military, the enemy gets a vote. So, for that matter, do other countries, whether friendly or not. When things do not go exactly according to plan, any decent strategy and any capable leader adapt. Indeed any decent foreign policy strategy begins with the recognition for backup plans, since inevitably things will not go exactly according to plan. Other countries rarely respond to our initial strategic moves in precisely the way we might wish. The question then becomes: What is plan B? **Obama is tactically very flexible**, but at the level of grand strategy he seems to have no backup plan. There is simply no recognition of the possibility that world politics might not operate on the post-Vietnam liberal assumptions he has imbibed and represented over the years. Obama’s critics often describe him as providing no strong foreign policy leadership. They underestimate him. Actually he has a very definite idea of where he wants to take the United States. **His guiding foreign policy idea is** that of **international accommodation**, sparked by American example. He pursues that overarching concept with great tactical pliability but without any sign of ideological or basic revision since coming into office. Yet empirically, in one case after another, the strategy is not working. This is a kind of leadership, to be sure, but leadership in the wrong direction. **Obama believes that liberal domestic initiatives will bolster American economic power and competitiveness.** How can the Obama administration adapt and adjust to the failures of its strategy of accommodation? It can admit that the attempted diplomatic engagement of Iran has failed, and shift toward a strategy of comprehensive pressure against that regime. It can make it abundantly clear to both the Taliban and al Qaeda that the United States will not walk away from Afghanistan, despite the beginning drawdown. It can start treating Russia as a geopolitical rival, which it is, rather than simply as a diplomatic partner. It can strengthen U.S. missile defenses as a form of insurance against nuclear proliferators. There is a long list of policy recommendations that can be made on specific regional and functional matters, but the prior and most important point is the need for a change in mentality. President Obama needs to stop working on the assumption that U.S. foreign policy concessions or gestures directed at the gallery of elite transatlantic opinion — whether on nuclear arms control, counterterrorism, or climate change — will somehow be reciprocated by specific foreign governments in the absence of some very hard bargaining. He needs to grasp that U.S. strategic disengagement from specific regional theaters, whether promised or underway, is taken as a sign of weakness in those regions and not simply as a sign of benevolent restraint. He needs to recognize that America’s international reputation consists not only of working toward his own definition of the moral high ground, but also very much of a reputation for strength, and specifically of a reputation for the willingness to use force. He needs to stop operating on the premise that past American foreign policy decisions are the ultimate source of much violent discord in the world today. He needs to be willing to divide the international system conceptually and operationally into friends and enemies, as they actually exist, and to support America’s friends while pressuring and opposing its enemies relentlessly. Finally, he needs to admit the limited effect of his own personal charisma on the foreign policies of other governments. The president of the United States is not an international community organizer. If the conceptual framework that underpins Obama’s foreign policy strategy is altered, then better policies will flow on a wide range of specific issues. Obama needs to be willing to support America’s friends while pressuring and opposing its enemies relentlessly. Admittedly, there is little chance that Obama will concede any of this. One of the things we know from historical example is that presidents tend to keep operating on their own inbuilt foreign policy assumptions, even as contrary evidence piles up. It usually takes either a dramatic external shock, or a new administration altogether, to bring about a major revaluation of existing assumptions. Curiously, this resistance to contrary evidence in foreign policy appears to be even truer of highly educated, self-confident, and intelligent people with core ideological convictions — a description that certainly fits President Obama. **Obama is malleable on tactics**, and he takes great care to project an aura of sensible calm, but in truth **he is** a conviction **president powered by** certain core ideological beliefs and **vaulting policy ambitions**. His characteristic response when these core beliefs and ambitions are truly tested by opponents or events is not to bend, but to bristle. He is therefore particularly unlikely to admit or even perceive that a foreign policy strategy based upon faulty assumptions of international accommodation is failing or has failed. Nor is it politically convenient for him to do so. More likely, he will continue along his chosen path, offering nothing more than tactical adjustments, until some truly dramatic event occurs which brings his whole foreign policy strategy into question — an Iranian nuclear test, for example.

**Drains finite PC and trades off with top agenda priorities – despite increased Cuban American support**

**Peters, 10**

Phillip, Vice President Lexington Institute, Palabra Nueva, Monthly Journal of Havana, March,

<http://www.lexingtoninstitute.org/library/resources/documents/cuba/cuban-triangle/palabranuevamarch2010.pdf>

President Obama and Cuba President Barack Obama entered office with a promise of change. He follows an American president whose rhetoric for eight years expressed a strong desire to influence Cuba’s future but whose actions concentrated, paradoxically, on building walls rather than bridges between our nations. In his first year, President Obama has started building bridges. He allowed Cuban Americans to visit their loved ones in Cuba without restriction, set a new tone in Washington’s discourse toward the island, and opened the door to greater diplomatic contact between the two governments. These actions are significant, but they are very small in proportion to the fundamental change that many in Cuba and the United States would like to see. A poll taken in October 2009, for example, showed that **59 percent of Cuban Americans favor ending** all U.S. **restrictions** on travel to Cuba. **Yet considering Cuba’s place in U**nited **S**tates **foreign policy and the large number of challenges** that President **Obama confronts**, it may be that President **Obama’s modest** initial **actions toward Cuba are aligned with his own political possibilities and priorities**. The American **Presidency has large but limited power**. Hence **each Administration is forced to choose the issues and initiatives to which it will devote its energy**, the way the President spends his **time** every day, the **subjects** on which **he will address the** American **public, and how he will spend his political capital to influence** public opinion and **Congress.** Some of these choices are determined by the president’s campaign and the voters’ mandate. Many others are imposed, as President Obama learned with great clarity when he took office on January 20, 2009. As a Senator, Barack Obama had opposed the decision to go to war in Iraq, but the war was in progress when he became President, and he had to decide how to move it toward its end. He had supported the decision to wage war in Afghanistan against Al Qaeda, but he had to form his own strategy in that conflict. He confronted an American economy in crisis, with major failures in its financial system. There was a risk that the private credit system would stop functioning, creating a risk of depression. Like his predecessor, President Obama concluded that his only option was to seek Congressional support for massive government spending to stabilize credit markets and to stimulate the economy. On top of all this, President **Obama is pursuing his top legislative priority**, an ambitious plan to reform the health care sector. Few presidents have confronted such a large series of challenges in their first year in office. **In this context, it may be surprising that the Obama Administration took even small actions on Cuba policy**, especially when one considers that it has not formed any major initiative toward Latin America and the Caribbean in general. With regard to Cuba, President Obama began by delivering on his campaign promises. As a candidate, he had told Cuban Americans that he would permit family visits without restriction, and last September he issued new regulations allowing them to visit as frequently as they like, and for as long as they like. As a result, last December there were about 50 flights per week between Miami and Havana. He removed limits on the amount of money that can be sent as family remittances, and he eliminated President Bush’s narrow definition of “family,” which had prevented visits and remittances to uncles, aunts, and cousins. He also promised as a candidate to set a new course in American diplomacy by pursuing talks with countries with which the United States has had longstanding differences over ideology or security matters. As President, he renewed twice-yearly consultations with Cuba to review our countries’ bilateral accords on migration matters. Cuba and the United States have also begun discussions with regard to re-establishing direct postal service. He also took actions that he had not discussed in his campaign. Last September, he removed almost all restrictions on gift parcels that Americans can send to people and non-governmental organizations in Cuba. Under President Bush, such packages could only be sent to family members and could only consist of a short list of items. Now, any American can send packages to Cubans containing any item that people normally exchange as gifts. In June, the United States joined a consensus at the Organization of American States that repealed the 1962 resolution that suspended Cuba’s membership in that organization due to Marxist-Leninist ideology and ties to the Soviet Union. Cuba’s renewed participation now depends on Cuba requesting to return, after which a “process of dialogue” would take place “in accordance with the practices, purposes and principles” of the OAS. The Obama Administration has quietly changed policy toward cultural and academic contacts, granting visas to Cuban scholars and artists that were routinely denied during the Bush Administration. The Havana concert organized by the Colombian singer Juanes, a resident of the United States, could not have occurred without licenses approved by the Obama Administration. Los Van Van and Omara Portuondo are about to perform a series of concerts in the United States, and Cuban artists such as La Charanga Habanera have performed here already. Universities and research institutions are resuming the kind of academic exchanges they conducted with Cuban scholars in the past. And last September, a group of Cuban officials and scientists visited Washington to discuss environmental protection with American experts from universities and private institutions. The Americans traveled to Cuba in October to continue the discussions. The result is new collaboration in protecting our shared marine environment – and hope that the two governments might some day collaborate in this field as well. President Obama has allowed American companies to negotiate with Cuba to provide three types of telecommunications services: roaming agreements for cellular phones, establishment of fiber optic cables for voice and Internet communication, and satellite radio and television services. To date, no agreements have been reached. President Obama has also changed the tone in U.S.-Cuba relations. The clearest and most remarkable example was unplanned, and came in response to a reporter’s question at the hemispheric summit in Trinidad last spring. Asked what he had learned in his discussions with other leaders, President Obama responded that many had talked about “the thousands of doctors from Cuba that are dispersed all throughout the region, and upon which many of these countries heavily depend.” He remarked that Cuba’s medical missions are “a reminder for us in the United States that if our only interaction with many of these countries is drug interdiction, if our only interaction is military, then we may not be developing the connections that can, over time, increase our influence and have a beneficial effect when we need to try to move policies that are of concern to us forward in the region.” In the arena of direct diplomacy with Cuba, the Obama Administration has sought to end the restrictions that limit American diplomats to Havana and Cuban diplomats to the Washington, D.C. area. The electronic signboard that the Bush Administration had installed on the façade of the U.S. Interests Section in Havana was turned off last June. The odd post that the Bush Administration created in the State Department – that of “Cuba Transition Coordinator” – has been quietly abolished. And while President Obama, like all his predecessors, presses Cuba for changes in domestic policies regarding civil and political liberties, his approach is different. According to a report last October in Madrid’s El Pais that the White House did not contradict, President Obama sent the following message through Spain’s foreign minister, who was about to travel to Havana: “Let him tell the Cuban authorities that we understand that they cannot change things overnight but that, after a few years have gone by and we look back, it should be clear that this was the moment when change began. If not, there will be deep disappointment.” One cannot minimize the importance of these changes in one year. However, United States policy toward Cuba is like a large machine that has been built over five decades by a multitude of designers and engineers – and the bulk of that machine is unchanged, in form and function. **Washington continues to label Cuba a “state sponsor of terrorism.” Its economic sanctions continue to block nearly all bilateral trade**, with the exception of U.S. agricultural exports to Cuba. U.S. sanctions continue to affect Cuban commerce with other countries. And while the new freedom for Cuban American travel is welcome, President Obama has created a deeply contradictory travel policy where one ethnic group can travel freely to Cuba, while all other Americans face licensing requirements and penalties derived from the Trading with the Enemy Act. What does President Obama’s first year tell us about the approach he will take toward Cuba in his next three or seven years in office? First, **it is clear that the Obama Administration is not seeking a major Cuba initiative**, and is far more likely to act through incremental steps than bold strokes. It does not accept the thesis that it can transform United States relations with Latin America through a radical, unilateral shift in its policy toward Cuba. **Cuba is unlikely to be made a high profile priority** in American foreign policy, which perhaps befits a relationship that includes many disagreements but is fundamentally stable and entails no security threats to the United States.

**sparks intense fights and powerful resistance that drain Obama’s finite capital and derail his agenda**

**Hadar, 9**

Leon T. Hadar is a research fellow in foreign policy studies at the Cato Institute in Washington DC, 5/11/9, http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/obama-must-move-beyond-pseudoevents

But style and media management aside, it is too early to conclude whether **Obama** will press ahead in transforming foreign policy pseudo-events into real events. His continuing **preoccupation with the economic crisis clearly limits his ability to launch** dramatic **diplomatic initiatives**. Doing away with the embargo with **Cuba** or reassessing US policy in the Middle East **would require costly fights with powerful forces in Washington**. For now, **Obama is expending his political capital elsewhere**. There is no doubt that through his personality and life-story, coupled with the manufactured media events, friendly gestures and cool style, Obama has been provided with an opportunity to change America’s global brand name. But the expectations created by the new president’s media image and style of foreign policy need to be matched to specific policy. Such **new initiatives in the foreign policy arena will force Obama to use his political capital.** Without a speedy end to the recession, **it is more likely that Obama will continue muddling through in the global arena** and refrain from enunciating any coherent grand strategy. The danger is that **political players at home** and abroad **will attempt to advance** their **policy agendas that** may **conflict with Obama’s**. If their efforts ignite a global crisis, that would test more than the new president’s style and public relations skills.

**General Link - Immigration reform specific spillover**

**Obama will use PC – key to immigration reform that turns whole aff - vital link to econ, all foreign policy effectiveness and US Latin relations – unfortunately even minor engagement efforts spark intense opposition from cuba lobby and cost capital**

**Shifter, 12**

By Michael Shifter, Inter American Dialogue, http://www.thedialogue.org/page.cfm?pageID=32&pubID=3186

Revista Ideele, December 27, 2012

Not surprisingly, **Obama has been explicit that reforming** the US’s shameful and broken **immigration** system **will be a top priority in his second term**. **There is every indication that he intends to use** some of his **precious political capital** – **especially in the first year** – **to push for serious change**. The biggest lesson of the last election was that the “Latino vote” was decisive. No one doubts that it will be even more so in future elections. During the campaign, many Republicans -- inexplicably -- frightened immigrants with offensive rhetoric. But the day after the election, there was talk, in both parties, of comprehensive immigration reform. **Despite** the sudden **optimism about immigration** reform, **there is**, of course, **no guarantee that it will happen**. **It will require a lot of negotiation and deal-making. Obama will have to invest a lot of his time and political capital -- twisting some arms, even in his own party. Resistance will not disappear**. **There is** also a **chance that something unexpected could** happen that would **put off consideration of immigration reform.** Following the horrific massacre at a Connecticut elementary school on December 14, for example, public pressure understandably mounted for gun control, at least the ban of assault weapons. But a decision to pursue that measure -- though desperately needed -- would **take away energy and time from other priorities like immigration.** Changes in immigration laws would reflect little about the foreign policy direction of the Obama administration. Rather, they should be interpreted as expressions of demographic transformations and political interests in the US. But **meaningful immigration reform would be welcomed throughout Latin America,** and particularly in Mexico (Mexicans make up some 60 percent of unauthorized migrants in the US), **where the issue has long been a source of tension** in the bilateral relationship. Among other issues that will be watched closely in Latin American policy are Cuba and drugs. In Florida Obama won about half of the Cuban American vote on November 6th -- a big increase from 2008. **Younger Cuban Americans want to change** a proven, failed **Cuba policy**, and **they are not single-issue voters like the older generation.** But **few are betting that Obama will move** boldly **to take advantage of the widening political space on Cuba policy. He will** likely **continue to be cautious. Cuba is not a high priority, there are few political benefits** for him, and ending the embargo would require an act of **Congress,** which still **has key Cuban American members** (three Senators!) **who will fight against any change**. US public opinion on the drug question seems to be changing as well. But despite the votes in Colorado and Washington to legalize recreational use of marijuana, Obama will move slowly, if at all, at the federal level. With good reason, Mexicans are especially sensitive to a basic contradiction: a trend towards marijuana decriminalization at the state level in the US, together with a national policy that emphasizes taking on drug cartels that deal to some extent in marijuana – and that have resulted in thousands of Mexican deaths. **No major changes should be expected in US Latin America policy in Obama’s second term**. In foreign policy, not surprisingly, priority attention will be given to the strategic turn to Asia, Iran’s nuclear program, the tumultuous Middle East, Europe’s severe, economic crisis, Pakistan, and the withdrawal of US troops from Afghanistan (which may be accompanied by agreements with the Taliban). Although Obama will have an entirely new foreign policy team, **key decisions on the most crucial issues will** probably **continue to be made at the White House -- not at State or Defense or Treasury**. Obama will be looking for opportunities to leave his mark, establish his legacy, and earn the Nobel Peace Prize he was awarded -- chiefly for not being George W. Bush -- in 2009. **But first Obama will have to put the US’s** financial and **economic house in order. That** difficult task **is not only vital for this country but for the world. It is the best foreign policy**.

**Turns aren’t salient – cuba is low priority, sparks fight and drains PC necessary for immigration**

**Hakim et al, 12**

Peter Hakim, Andrés Rozental, Rubens Barbosa, Riordan Roett, Ruben Olmos

Inter-American Dialogue’s Latin America Advisor, Peter Hakim is president emeritus and senior fellow of the Inter-American Dialogue, a Washington-based think tank on Western Hemisphere affairs. He served as president of the Dialogue from 1993 to 2010, writes and speaks widely on hemispheric issues, and has testified more than a dozen times before Congress. His articles have appeared in Foreign Affairs, Foreign Policy, The New York Times, The Washington Post, Miami Herald, Los Angeles Times, and Financial Times, and in newspapers and journals in Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Mexico, Peru, and other Latin American nations. He is a regular guest on CNN, BBC, CBS, CNN en Español and other prominent news stations around the world. He wrote a monthly column for the Christian Science Monitor for nearly ten years, and now serves as a board member of Foreign Affairs Latinoamerica and editorial advisor to Americaeconomia, where he also publishes a regular column11/8/12 http://www.thedialogue.org/page.cfm?pageID=32&pubID=3135

What Will Obama's Second Term Mean **for Latin America**? Q: Barack Obama was re-elected president of the United States on Tuesday. What is his vision for foreign policy and how does Latin America fit into his plans? How will Latin American leaders and their citizens react to the election results? **What** role did Latinos in the United States play in **the election** and what does that **mean for U.S. policy changes on** issues such as immigration, drugs and **Cuba**? A: Peter Hakim, member of the Advisor board and president emeritus of the Inter-American Dialogue: "Any speculation about Obama's second term has to come mainly from his first-term performance. The campaign was about the candidates and their biographies—not about issues. **Nothing suggests Congress will be more productive. The House remains** virtually **unchanged. The Senate will be more divisive** still as most remaining moderate Republicans and Democrats resigned or lost their seats. We will know soon whether compromise is possible when the lame-duck Congress returns next week, and begins discussion of the fiscal cliff embroglio. The best guess is that Congress will find a way, not to resolve the problem, but to defer its consequences. The election results focused attention on immigration policy, which both Republicans and Democrats may be motivated to address. President Obama's declared intention to address immigration was surely reinforced by the huge Latino vote. Many of the Republicans who blocked previous immigration initiatives will resist again. But some recognize their party may become irrelevant unless they take seriously the Latino and black constituencies that accounted for more than 40 percent of Obama's total. U.S. immigration reform would be a welcome change in most of Latin America, particularly in Mexico, Central America and the Caribbean. **Obama may seek** to pursue **further openings to Cuba**—**but these will be limited unless the Cuban government shows a willingness to reciprocate with new human rights measures or political changes**. Drug policy is not high on the U.S. agenda, but the approval in Colorado and Washington of ballot initiatives to legalize marijuana use may spark wider discussion on drug issues. But Mitt Romney offered the most significant policy proposal for Latin America, when called for more intensive U.S. efforts to pursue multiplying economic opportunities in the region." A: Andrés Rozental, member of the Advisor board, president of Rozental & Asociados in Mexico City and senior fellow at the Brookings Institution: "President Obama's re-election is a welcome development for Latin Americans in general, and Mexicans in particular. Although many of Obama's campaign promises in 2008 relevant to the region remain unrealized, there is a modicum of hope that as a leader in his second term, **with more political capital to spend, he can** **at least make a stronger effort to tackle comprehensive immigration reform** and trade issues critical to Latin American prosperity. **Although I don't foresee any major change in** the **U**nited **S**tates' foreign **policy toward the region, especially as long as Afghanistan, Iran and the Middle East remain priorities for Washington**, that may not necessarily be a bad thing. We often complain when Washington pays too much attention to us, and equally when there's less overt interest in the region, but I believe that Obama has mostly shown a much more mature attitude toward Latin America over the last four years than has traditionally been the case. This will hopefully also be the case as his administration continues through 2016. Presumably, there will continue to be a strong focus on completing ongoing trade negotiations, especially the Trans-Pacific Partnership, to open new opportunities for economic growth and hopefully a re-visiting of NAFTA as a key option to make North America more competitive on the global scene. Latinos played a key role in re-electing Obama, just as they did in 2008, and the one message that Republicans have to take home at this stage is that the anti-immigrant, exclusionary policies voiced during the campaign by Mitt Romney, the Tea Party and other conservatives were a key factor in their ultimate defeat. Many of Obama's liberal views on minority rights and tolerance turned out to be much more popular among Americans as a whole than the opposing Republican positions on those same issues." A: Rubens Barbosa, former ambassador of Brazil to the United States: "In his second term, Obama will be more interested in looking for his legacy in history. The U.S. government will tend to be more proactive and try to increase its influence in the current hot spots: Pakistan, Syria, Iran and elsewhere in the Middle East. The relationship with China will continue to be high on the foreign policy agenda. Having in mind this scenario, **Latin America will continue to be off the radar of U.S. decision makers: the region will remain a low priority for Washington.** Despite this fact, the reaction of the Latin American leaders and citizens to Obama's re-election has been very positive. The role of Latinos in the election was important and in some places crucial. **In terms of policy changes on** issues such as immigration, drugs and **Cuba, Obama will continue to face strong opposition from the Republican Party** but I would not be surprised if new ideas could be advanced by the administration especially in relation to immigration and Cuba." A: Riordan Roett, director of the Latin American Studies program at the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies: "While the president's re-election is welcome in general terms**, it is difficult to imagine Latin America will receive greater attention** in the next four years. **Congress remains deeply divided**. The administration's foreign policy priorities will continue to focus on China, the Middle East and the ongoing fiscal challenges. Given the strong turnout by the Latino community, **one area that should receive priority is** continued **immigration reform**, but it is the third rail for the Republican majority in the House. In general, the democratic governments of the region will welcome the president's election without great expectation for major policy initiatives. The populist regimes will continue to denounce any democratically elected administration. The **deadlock over Cuba will continue unless there is a dramatic leadership shift** to a new generation. The **major policy initiative** that would be welcome in the region is on drug policy, but that issue **will remain taboo**."

**Specifically saps PC necessary for immigration**

**Thornton 12**

Chester Thornton CEO & President, Gulf Coast Merchants and Trading International, Former member department of commerce District Export Council, December, 2012, http://hubpages.com/forum/topic/106831

**With the** 2012 Presidential Election having been conclude and as many of us predicted President **Obama** would be re-elected to a **second term**. While this fiscal cliff debate continues to drawn the major attention **and the Presidents future agenda** 2012-2016 for job creation and **immigration reform appears to take the present spotlight** as well, **I wonder if he has the political will or political capital to tackle** a very feckless embargo against **Cuba.** **Much** of the **opposition** to lifting the trade embargo **was generated by Anti-Castro groups** and individuals in the Miami, Florida communities, however in the past election the Obama Administration won the Cuban vote. If the major opposition has subsided and the American business communities supports lifting the embargo...would it be reasonable for the Obama adminstration to engage the battle once and for all?

**Cuba (Anti Castro) Lobby Links\***

**Drains capital - Cuba lobby most powerful, controls debate on everything cuba and ensures majority congressional opposition**

**Stieglitz, 11**

Matthew, Law Clerk at Vladeck, Waldman, Elias & Engelhard, P.C, Judicial Intern at United States District Court, Masters @ Cornell University, http://www.thepresidency.org/storage/Fellows2011/Stieglitz-\_Final\_Paper.pdf

This collaboration represented positive dialogue with Cuba, yet it did nothing to improve relations with Cuba. Subsequent to the Balsero crisis, the US **Congress acted to enforce stricter standards towards the island** in a landmark legislation that would effectively relegate the presidency to the backburner in relation to Cuba**. Driven** in part **by** CANF and the **lobbying efforts of the exile community**, the Cuban Liberty & Solidarity Act was passed in 1996 (also known as the Helms-Burton Act) further complicating relations with Cuba (Bardach, 2002). Essentially, the **legislation cedes greater authority to the US Congress** in ending the trade embargo, **making a** potential **pro-embargo majority in Congress the powerbrokers on everything US-Cuba related.** Simply stated, the Cuban Liberty & Democratic Solidarity Act disempowers the presidency in relation to Cuba. While the legislation calls for a variety of different elements, it has two **key components** in relation to the presidency: the embargo **can only be repealed by Congressional vote,** and it cannot be repealed until a democratic government is elected in Cuba that includes neither Fidel nor Raul Castro. This clearly hinders normalization because it effectively mitigates any transition efforts or progressive policies that the Castro brothers sponsor. Unless the legislation is repealed or amended, any progressive efforts or dialogue from the Cuban government will be irrelevant so long as the Castro brothers continue to lead the government. It also **constrains t**he US presidency, as President **Obama**—or any future president— cannot simply end the embargo with Cuba. Instead, **presidents must defer to the US Congress, which will make progressive policy with Cuba difficult.** **This** again **exemplifies the strength and importance of the Cuban-American lobby in policy discussions with Cuba.** **Not only did their efforts result in Congressional legislation that effectively ceded control of US relations with Cuba** to Congress, **but they also imposed the agenda of the electorate on American foreign policy. Subsequent to this legislation passing, the Cuban-American lobby would again work to have its voice heard** when a young boy, Elian González, was found floating in American waters, one of three survivors of an ill-fated voyage that claimed the lives of eleven people, including his mother. Under the Wet Foot, Dry Foot policy, Elian González could not be granted asylum in the United States because he was found in water. While his family in the US was more than willing to take the boy in, his status as a minor complicated matters with his father remaining in Cuba. **This placed the** Clinton **Administration in the middle of a highly contested debate that the Cuban-American electorate immediately moved to shape** (Bardach, 2002). The González case called into questions components of family law, immigration law, refugee policy, and politics, and presented the Cuban-American electorate its greatest opportunity to embarrass the Castro government. For President Clinton, it presented a crisis that necessitated caution, and would ultimately entail a moral debate that stirred immense media coverage of the Cuba dilemma itself. González's mother drowned in late 1999 while traveling with her son to the United States, and while the INS originally placed him with paternal family in Miami, his father objected to González remaining in the United States (Bardach, 2002). What ensued was a media nightmare, with national media outlets descending on Miami to interview the boy. Local politicians became involved, with the case eventually being deliberated in court where the family’s asylum petition was dismissed and González was ordered to return to his father. President Clinton almost exclusively deferred to Attorney General Janet Reno during the proceedings, who ultimately ordered the return of González to his father prior to the court decision. González’s return to Cuba coincided with the beginning of yet another decade in which the Cuban trade embargo would continue, and to date is the last controversial event of US-Cuba policy during the Castro regime (Bardach, 2002). Reflecting upon the Castro reign during the 20th century, **two themes emerge: the prominence of the Cuban-American community, and the actions of US presidents towards Cuba. The clout of the Cuban-American lobby cannot be understated, as the 2000** presidential **election showed** us. President George W. **Bush secured** his **victory** as president **in no small part due to the Cuban-American vote, which he and** Al **Gore campaign vigorously for**. **As such, the Gore and Bush campaigns remained relatively silent** on the Elian González case, leaving the matter to the courts **so as not to risk any backlash from the Cuban-American community**. After his victory, President Bush tightened restrictions on Cuba much like his Republican predecessors. He further restricted travel to the island for CubanAmericans, reduced the amount of remittances that could be sent to the island, placed Cuba on terror-watch lists after 9/11, and maintained that Cuba was a strategic threat to national security (Erlich, 2009). Further, cultural and academic exchanges were suspended, and many Cuban and American artists found themselves unable to attain visas to travel between Cuba and the United States to share the rich culture of both nations. By the time President Bush left office, the only Americans legally allowed to enter Cuba were journalists, family members (who could only go once every three years), and those visiting the island for religious reasons.

**Opposition lobby far more powerful, drains PC and focus – progressive Cuban-Americans have zero influence**

**Stieglitz, 11**

Matthew, Law Clerk at Vladeck, Waldman, Elias & Engelhard, P.C, Judicial Intern at United States District Court, Masters @ Cornell University, http://www.thepresidency.org/storage/Fellows2011/Stieglitz-\_Final\_Paper.pdf

While President Bush’s **actions were clearly a reflection of partisanship, they represented a greater component of managing the Cuban-American electorate, lobby, and agenda.** Essentially, **Congressional Cuban-American leadership maintains a stance of isolationism towards Cuba that American presidents have not risked challenging** since President Carter. **Every president, regardless of party affiliation, has had to become adept at catering to the Cuban-American lobby, and this continues to this day**. It reached its apex with Jorge Mas Canosa and CANF, but in recent years has waned slightly. Nevertheless, **the power dynamics of the Cuban-American vote have been too risky to challenge, especially with Florida’s electoral votes hanging in the balance for every** presidential **election From a financial perspective, the campaign contributions of CubanAmericans highlight how Cuban-American issues will not be ignored, and have kept them in the limelight despite other, more pressing,** foreign policy **debates in recent years. Historically, the Cuba lobby could use Cold War tactics of distaste for communism to drive American inaction** towards the island. **Recently, this has shifted towards heavily criticizing Cuba for its deplorable human rights record**, which has been a legitimate complaint since the 1960s. In recent years, Cuba has imprisoned political activists, often without cause, which raised awareness for Cuba’s government-sponsored infringements upon civil rights in the form of limited or non-existent due process and freedom of speech is (Erickson, 2009**). These contemporary issues are paramount to any future dialogue with Cuba, and transcend partisan politics in Washington. Through all of this, it seems difficult that progressive Cuban-Americans would stand any chance against their conservative counterparts**. As stated above, **the community has maintained an anti-Castro stance for decades that has only slightly shifted since the power transfer to Raul** Castro. Regardless, the HelmsBurton Act prevents any embargo removal so long as either Castro brother is in power, and limits presidential action in that regard as well. Thus, **finding the voice for progressive Cuban-Americans almost was unimportant in light of the greater historical and contemporary issues surrounding Cuba**, until 2007.

**Cuba opposition lobby outweighs all turns – more power, issue investment, dominate debate and control spin**

**Stieglitz, 11**

Matthew, Law Clerk at Vladeck, Waldman, Elias & Engelhard, P.C, Judicial Intern at United States District Court, Masters @ Cornell University, http://www.thepresidency.org/storage/Fellows2011/Stieglitz-\_Final\_Paper.pdf

Unfortunately, **misperceptions** surrounding the social class of the Marielitos **permeated the Cuban-American community** that was already established in Miami. With Castro on record as saying he had “flushed the toilets of Cuba on the United States” **media attention surrounding the issue led to exaggerated coverage** of the Mariel migrants (Portes, 1987). This led to the Cubans who came during the boatlift being stigmatized by Cuban-Americans already in the US. The fact that close to half of the Mariel migrants were Afro-Cuban or of mixed race, and had spent the majority of their adult lives in a communist regime made them unfamiliar to the predominantly white capitalist Cuban-American community. Nevertheless, most Marielitos went on to integrate themselves into American society and eventually were accepted by Cuban-Americans. Ultimately, Mariel represented a blow to the Carter Administration, paving the way for a Reagan victory while losing any political capital gained from the Cuban-American community prior to 1980. As the coming **decades** would **show, Cuban-Americans** would **form** **arguably the most dominant ethnic lobby in the United States, quickly ascending to political positions of prominence that have cemented their voice in all subsequent policy discussions regarding Cuba.** This is also important within the context of the Electoral College, as **Cuban-Americans** for the first time **would be a significant contributing factor** to the Florida vote **during presidential elections.**

PRESIDENT RONALD REAGAN & CUBA

Although not solely responsible for his election loss, the Mariel boatlift did not help President Carter’s reelection bid at all, whether among Cuban-Americans or other Americans. With Ronald Reagan’s election came an increase in Cold War rhetoric and a return of sorts to the isolationism of Cuba that was prevalent in US Cuba policy prior to President Carter’s first term. The travel ban to Cuba was reinstated, Cuban diplomats might as well have been shunt from Washington, and Cuba was placed on a terror watch list (Erlich, 2009). However, the Reagan years arguably saw less of a focus on Cuba than they did on Cuban-Americans, particularly with respect to electoral politics. Collaboration with the Cuban American elite was now going to shape the Cuba dialogue, which, combined with the tightening of other restrictions on the island, set the framework for **the rise of the Cuban-American lobby.**

The Reagan Administration’s collaboration with the Cuban-American elite led to the **formation of the Cuban American National Foundation (CANF**), which essentially was **a brainchild of Republican Party strategists**. Led by Jorge Mas Canosa, a wealthy Cuban exile who had served as a CIA operative during the Bay of Pigs, CANF’s mission was **to advance the anti-Castro agenda. This hardline stance towards Cuba was the philosophy of a majority of Cuban-Americans** at the time, and was meant to pressure a transition to a free and democratic Cuba (Erlich, 2009). **Using AIPAC as a model, CANF became the most visible of the Cuba lobbies, with the Miami exile leadership ushering in a new era of ethnic lobbying. CANF would go on to lobby Democrats and Republicans alike to liberate Cuba from Castro, using aggressive media campaigns that were built on the financial contributions of nearly the entire exile community**. A Political Action Committee, the “Free Cuba PAC”, would also be formed to supplement the efforts of CANF, **ensuring the Cuban-American voice was heard while greater awareness to Cuban issues was raised** (Sweig, 2009).

All of this was made possible by assistance from the Reagan Administration combined with the skills of the Cuban elite who migrated to Miami during the 1960’s. These exiles arrived with a cultural repertoire that was conducive to entrepreneurial pursuits, and a language advantage that made trade with Latin America easier. Thus, the Cuban presence in Miami made the city an economic intermediary of US-Latin American trade. As **Cubans were able to use their economic power and geographical location to** secure an advantage in trade, they also used it to **gain control of** local **politics and pursue their economic and political “Cuba” agenda. This transformed** Miami into a city whose local **politics** are **both conservative and significantly concerned with US-Cuba policy** (Sassen & Portes, 1993).

**plan costs PC and angers most powerful lobby - cuba policy requires Obama push and he gets blame anyway –**

**Stieglitz, 11**

Matthew, Law Clerk at Vladeck, Waldman, Elias & Engelhard, P.C, Judicial Intern at United States District Court, Masters @ Cornell University, http://www.thepresidency.org/storage/Fellows2011/Stieglitz-\_Final\_Paper.pdf

CONCLUSION President Barack Obama’s election came with a variety of campaign promises, including addressing the US-Cuba embargo. However, after two years in office, normalized relations with Cuba have yet to materialize. **Recent developments have pushed legislators to review** the continued existence of the embargo**, but the history of the US presidency and the blockade seems to dictate that the American presidency will ultimately be what causes any policy change.** Thus, how and when will the embargo end? Clearly, **American presidents have been directly tied to foreign policy towards Cuba.** However, this does not provide clarity to what the future holds for diplomatic relations with the island. **Progressive policies and actions** in both nations in recent months seem to offer hope of change, yet such a scenario **remains elusive**. During the embargo’s existence, **Cuban-Americans have maintained an active voice against the Castro regime. The community’s leaders have met with and advised multiple US presidents on Cuba, gained immense political clout** in Miami, **and** have **formed one of the most dominant ethnic lobbies in Washington**. **The result has been a hardline stance on Cuba that progressive Cuban-Americans have failed to overcome.** **While the community’s younger generation, as well as recent arrivals** from Cuba, **prefers** a policy of **engagement, normalized relations do not seem feasible at this point in time.** The recent **election victory of House Republicans, combined with the political riskiness of addressing** the US-**Cuba** embargo prior to the 2012 presidential election**, make it highly unlikely** President **Obama will address Cuba** during his first term as president. Nevertheless, his administration has more than enough tools at their disposal to begin moving the Cuba dialogue forward, even if the Executive Office is compromised in its ability to end the embargo.

**Overcoming opposition on cuba policy requires Obama PC**

**Stieglitz, 11**

Matthew, Law Clerk at Vladeck, Waldman, Elias & Engelhard, P.C, Judicial Intern at United States District Court, Masters @ Cornell University, http://www.thepresidency.org/storage/Fellows2011/Stieglitz-\_Final\_Paper.pdf

**From a political standpoint,** President **Obama needs public relations victories to shift the opinion on Cuba.** As the 1996 Cuban Liberty & Solidarity Act shows, **his power is essentially restricted** in addressing the embargo. **He needs Congressional action** on the matter, whether it is an amendment of the Cuban Liberty & Solidarity Act or their decision to end the embargo themselves. **This is complicated by the power dynamics of the Cuban-American electorate and the conservative Cuban-Americans in Congress.** Thus, President Obama must divert his attention to areas he can control. The law regarding this is simple, as he has no unilateral control to amend the embargo. Legally, he cannot do anything to the embargo itself, but **politically, his administration can pressure Congress for action while allocating political capital towards the Cuba issue.** Any **executive orders he can sign** that are not banned by current American law **can assist** the effort to normalized relations. **But it is through the president’s ability to gain political capital and support for different initiatives that** President **Obama can take steps towards normalization** of relations **with Cuba,** as highlighted by the recommendations below.

**Plan saps Obama’s capital**

**Birns and Mills 13** (Larry, Director of the Council on Hemispheric Affairs, Frederick B., COHA Senior Research Fellow, 01/30, “Best Time for U.S.– Cuba Rapprochement Is Now,” http://www.coha.org/best-time-for-u-s-cuba-rapprochement-is-now/)

Despite the basic intransigence of US policy towards Cuba, in recent years, important changes have been introduced by Havana: state control over the economy has been diminished; most travel restrictions affecting both Americans and Cubans on the island have been lifted; and the “group of 75” Cuban dissidents detained in 2003 have been freed. Washington has all but ignored these positive changes by Havana, but when it comes to interacting with old foes such as those of Myanmar, North Korea, and Somalia, somehow constructive dialogue is the order of the day. **One reason for this inconsistency is the continued opposition by the anti-Castro lobby to a change of course by Washington. The anti-Castro lobby and their allies in the US Congress argue that the reforms coming out of Havana are too little too late and that political repression continues unabated. They continue to see the embargo as a tool for coercing either more dramatic reforms or regime change.** It is true that the reformist tendency in Cuba does not include a qualitative move from a one party system to political pluralism. Lamentably, Cuba reportedly continues to use temporary detentions and the occasional jailing of non-violent dissidents to limit the parameters of political debate and total freedom of association. The authors agree that no non-violent Cuban dissident should be intimidated, detained or jailed. But continuing to maliciously turn the screws on Havana has never provided an incentive for more democracy in any sense of the word nor has it created a political opening into which Cuba, with confidence, could enter. The easing of tensions between Washington and Havana is more likely to contribute to the evolution of a more democratic form of socialism on the island, the early stages of which we may presently be witnessing. In any case the precise form of such change inevitably should and will be decided in Cuba, not in Washington or Miami. To further moves towards rapprochement with Cuba, the U.S. State Department should remove the country from the list of state sponsors of terrorism. It is an invention to depict Havana as a state sponsor of terrorism, a charge only levied by the State Department under pressure from Hill hardliners. As researcher Kevin Edmunds, quite properly points out: “This position is highly problematic, as the United States has actively engaged in over 50 years of economic and covert destabilization in Cuba, going so far as blindly protecting wanted terrorists such as Luis Posada Carilles and Orlando Bosch, both former CIA agents accused of dozens of terrorist attacks in Cuba and the United States ” (Nov. 15, 2012, Kevin Edmonds blog). It was precisely the propensity of some anti-Castro extremists to plan terrorist attacks against Cuba that urgently motivated the infiltration of such groups by the Cuban five as well as the close monitoring of these organizations by the FBI. Another gesture of good will would be for the White House to grant clemency to the Cuban five: Gerardo Hernandez, Ramón Labañino, Fernando Gonzalez, Antonio Guerrero and René Gonzalez. They are Cuban nationals who were convicted in a Miami court in 2001 and subsequently sentenced to terms ranging from 15 years to double life, mostly on charges of conspiracy to commit espionage. Despite requests for a change of venue out of Miami, which at first was granted and later denied, the trial took place in a politically charged Miami atmosphere that arguably tainted the proceedings and compromised justice. Supporters maintain that the Cuban five had infiltrated extremist anti-Castro organizations in order to prevent terrorist attacks against Cuba and did not pose any security threat to the United States. It would be an important humanitarian gesture to let them go home. Perhaps such a gesture might facilitate reciprocity on the part of Cuban authorities when it comes to American engineer Alan Gross who is presently being detained in a Cuban jail. **There would probably be a political price to pay by the Obama administration for taking steps towards reconciliation with Havana**, but if Obama’s election to a second term means that there is to be a progressive dividend, surely such a dividend ought to include a change in US policy towards the island. Mirabile dictu, the Administration can build on the small steps it has already taken. Since 2009, Washington has lifted some of the restrictions on travel between the US and Cuba and now allows Cuban Americans to send remittances to relatives on the island. The Cuba Reconciliation Act (HR 214) introduced by Representative Jose Serrano (D-NY) on January 4, 2013, and sitting in a number of congressional committees, would repeal the harsh terms of the Cuban Democracy Act of 1992 and the Helms-Burton Act of 1996, both of which toughened the embargo during the special period in Cuba. The Cuba Reconciliation Act, however, is unlikely to get much traction, especially with ultra-hardliner Representative Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (R-FL), chairing the House Foreign Relations Committee, and her counterpart, Robert Menendez (D-NJ), who is about to lead the Senate Foreign Relations Body. Some of the anti-Castro Cuban American community would likely view any of the three measures advocated here as a capitulation to the Castro brothers. But as we have argued, a pro-democracy and humanist position is not in any way undermined, but might in fact be advanced by détente. An end to the embargo has been long overdue, and the judgment of history may very well be that it ought never to have been started

**Opposition lobby most powerful and controls debate on ALL policies related to cuba**

**Stieglitz, 11**

Matthew, Law Clerk at Vladeck, Waldman, Elias & Engelhard, P.C, Judicial Intern at United States District Court, Masters @ Cornell University, http://www.thepresidency.org/storage/Fellows2011/Stieglitz-\_Final\_Paper.pdf

These events helped facilitate the creation of Radio Martí, which was intended to counter the Cuban perspective. Designed to launch alternative “Castro broadcasts” for the island, a counter voice was offered through different mediums including news broadcasts and talk shows. Radio Martí would also serve as the precursor to TV Martí, which Congress appropriated $16 million towards launching in 1990 (Sweig, 2009). **The significance** of both **rests on** two pillars: **utter despise for Castro, and the ability of the Cuban-American lobby to orchestrate their creation and continuation.** Despite both programs eventually being blocked by Cuba, taxpayer dollars still fund both, and Castro for a time would use both as a representation of the Cuban-American agenda against his government.

Through initiatives such as these and others, **the work of CANF towards Cuba was immeasurable, and goes beyond ensuring Cuba’s dominance of foreign policy debates among presidential candidates** from the Reagan Administration on. **CANF became a major player in all policy negotiations regarding Cuba**, with Mas Canosa personally advising multiple US presidents on Cuba. Additionally**, the key members of the exile leadership fostered a culture of zero tolerance for Cuban Americans who did not maintain the mission of CANF** (Bardach, 2002). Going so far as to blacklist members of their own community from jobs, **the exile leadership became an established** anti-Castro **entity that would permeate national** and Miami **politics, setting the stage for the political rise of prominent Cuban-American politicians** (Portes, 1987). Further, CANF and other initiatives would serve as a significant source of employment for Cuban arrivals, cementing Miami’s status as an economic international powerhouse and creating a robust economy in Miami, where two thirds of the Cuban-American population in the US now resides (Portes & Sassen, 1993).

In summation, the 1980s witnessed arguably the greatest empowerment for Cuban-Americans in history. During the Reagan and G. H.W. Bush administrations **financial resources were funneled towards programs advancing the Cuba lobby’s agenda. Tighter sanctions were imposed** on the island, **Cuban-American representation in the government increased, and any potential for rapprochement with Cuba was officially eliminated**. Thus, the Reagan years could be described as one **that brought about policy victories for anti-Castro Cuban-Americans, effectively empowering the Cuban-American electorate, while further distancing the United States from Cuba.**

**Menendez Link/Menendez Key**

**Plan alienates Menendez – *spillover uniquely likely* and he’s key to agenda – has functional unilateral veto**

**Goodman, 12**

Alana goodman, Editor @ Commentary Magazine, 12/18/12

<http://www.commentarymagazine.com/2012/12/18/menendez-expected-to-take-over-as-foreign-relations-chair/#more-814117>

Finally, some good news to come out of John Kerry’s likely secretary of state appointment: Sen. John Kerry’s (D-Mass.) anticipated move to the State Department would leave the **Senate Foreign Relations Committee in the hands of** Sen. Robert **Menendez** (D-N.J.), **who has consistently bucked the White House on Cuba** and Iran. Menendez is next in line to take over the panel if Sen. Barbara Boxer (D-Calif.) opts to keep her chairmanship of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, as is widely expected. **That would give Menendez a key role** in approving diplomatic nominees and international treaties — **crucial leverage to demand a tougher stance against America’s foes**. **“You can’t work around the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee when he’s willing to dig in his heels on important issues,”** said Roger Noriega, a former assistant secretary of State for Western Hemisphere Affairs under President George W. Bush who’s enthused by Menendez’s possible promotion. “At the same time, **he’s going to be expected to be a team player** — **but that has its limits.** “I think **he’ll give folks in the administration something to think about before they cross him, frankly**.” **When it comes to** Iran **sanctions, it would be difficult to find a stronger Democratic senator than Menendez. He’s been active on the issue for years,** at least since his time on the House international relations committee (now foreign affairs). On the Senate finance committee, he’s joined up with Senator Mark Kirk on several critically important Iran sanctions amendments. But **the White House can’t be thrilled with Menendez’s likely new role. He’s had no reservations about fighting the Obama administration over sanctions, nor clashing with them over** Armenia and **Cuba. The last thing Obama wants is a critic from his own party attacking** his Iran **policy from such a prominent perch** in the Senate.

**Israel Lobby Link**

**Triggers intense opposition Israel lobby and congressional allies – they hate cuba and strategically ally with anti-Castro lobby**

**Madsen, 11**

Wayne Madsen, Investigative journalist, author and syndicated columnist. Has some twenty years experience in security issues. As a U.S. Naval Officer, he managed one of the first computer security programs for the U.S. Navy. He has been a frequent political and national security commentator on ABC, NBC, CBS, PBS, CNN, BBC, Al Jazeera, and MS-NBC. He has been invited to testify as a witness before the US House of Representatives, the UN Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda, and an terrorism investigation panel of the French government. A member of the Society of Professional Journalists (SPJ) and the National Press Club., 6/20/11, http://www.strategic-culture.org/news/2011/06/20/the-outsourcing-of-influence-peddling-to-the-israeli-lobby.html

T**he confluence of the Israel Lobby with pressure groups** such as those that support the Saakashvili regime in Georgia **is not an isolated situation**. Before the rise to power of the Justice and Development Party (AK Party) of Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan in Turkey, Israel could rely on the support of successive Turkish governments. Turkey, in turn, established its own Washington-based lobbying group, the American Turkish Council, which was modeled on the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC). It was recently learned from Turkish government officials in Washington that the secret network of Turkish military officers, politicians, intelligence officers, professors, and journalists known as “Ergenekon,” which plotted a series of coups against independent-minded Turkish governments, was a construct of the CIA and Mossad. An in-depth investigation of the Ergenekon network conducted by the Turkish intelligence service discovered that many of the key players in Ergenekon were Dönme, the descendants of Turkish Jews who converted to Islam and, to varying degrees, now practice a combination of Kabbalah Judaism and Islamic Sufism while remaining secular and Turkish nationalist in the mold of Turkish state founder Kemal Ataturk. Similarly, **the Israel Lobby has made common cause with the right-wing Cuban exile community in Florida, which has become as influential in the politics of south Florida as the many Jews and Israelis who live there. The convergence of interests of pro-Israelis and Cuban** Gusano **exiles can best be seen in the current chair of the House Foreign Relations Committee, Representative** Ileana **Ros-Lehtinen**, who represents a congressional district in south Florida. **Ros-Lehtinen**, who is **of Cuban Jewish descent, is one of AIPAC’s** and the ADL’s **best friends in Congress. She is** also **a vociferous opponent** of the governments of Venezuela and Nicaragua, both of which have severed diplomatic relations with Israel and have recognized the independence of Abkhazia, to the dismay of Israel, AIPAC, and the ADL. While Ros-**Lehtinen rattles sabers against** Venezuela, Nicaragua, Ecuador, Brazil, Argentina, Bolivia, Uruguay, and other **Latin American nations** that have recognized Palestine within its 1967 borders, she supports continued U.S. military assistance to Colombia, Honduras, Costa Rica, and Panama, Israel’s last four remaining allies in Latin America. Ros-Lehtinen, while decrying alleged human rights “abuses” in Venezuela and Nicaragua, is silent on actual abuses in Colombia, where Israelis routinely supply weapons and advisers to the government in its inhumane war with the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), peasants, and labor unionists. The trial in New York of Russian air cargo services owner Viktor Bout for allegedly trying to sell weapons to the FARC is one outcome of **the strategic alliance between Israel, its U.S. Lobby, and the right-wing Latin American exiles** and intelligence operatives who call Miami their home. The conviction and imprisonment of former Yukos owner Mikhail Khodorkovsky, considered a major agent-of-influence for Israel in Russia and a one-time potential President of Russia, has placed Russia in the same category as Venezuela, Nicaragua, Abkhazia, Turkey, and other **nations** that have **incurred the ire of the Israel Lobby either directly or via outsourcing deals made with strategic allies** such as the Georgians, **Cuban exiles**, or, now, in the case of Turkey, the Armenians. In the past, AIPAC always ensured that “Armenian genocide” resolutions failed in the U.S. Congress, a payback for Turkey’s support for Israel. With Turkey adopting an independent foreign policy, AIPAC and the ADL are now strategically allied with the Armenian lobby to push for Armenian genocide resolutions in Washington and elsewhere.

**General link/A2: Turns – On Balance\***

***ANY*  change Requires Obama push and tons of PC –opposition far more intense, controls *the* key committee chair, and theoretical support blocked by Gross issue – even advocates admit**

**Miroff, 13**

Nick Miroff, covers Mexico, Central America, and the Caribbean for the Washington Post. He has been a staff writer since 2006, reporting on politics, immigration, crime, and development in northern Virginia for the Post’s Metro desk until 2009. He earned a Master’s degree at the UC Berkeley Graduate School, 1/2/13, http://www.globalpost.com/dispatch/news/regions/americas/cuba/121231/kerry-cuba-secretary-of-state-obama

Can Kerry **make friends with Cuba? Probably not.** While he’s a critic of US policy toward Havana, **he’ll have a hard time actually changing anything.** At the last Summit of the Americas, held in Colombia in April, Washington’s rivals in Latin America and its political allies had the same piece of advice for better US diplomacy in the region: get over your Cuba fixation. Now, with Sen. John Kerry (D-Mass.) likely to be confirmed as the next secretary of state, the United States will have a top diplomat who has been a frequent critic of America’s 50-year-old effort to force regime change in Havana. In recent years, Kerry has been the Senate’s most prominent skeptic of US-funded pro-democracy efforts that give financial backing to dissident groups in Cuba and beam anti-Castro programming to the island through radio and television programs based in Miami. Kerry has also favored lifting curbs on US travel to the island, and opening up American tourism to the only country in the world the US government restricts its own citizens from visiting. For the rest of Latin America, where leaders say they're eager for Washington to modernize its view of the region and engage in new ways, Cuba remains “a litmus test” for the Obama presidency, according to Julia Sweig, director of Latin American Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations. “The strategic benefits of getting Cuba right would reverberate throughout the Americas,” said Sweig, calling Kerry “ideally suited to the task.” **“Kerry's instincts** and experience **in Latin America are to see past lingering and often toxic ideology in the US Congress and bureaucracy** in favor of pragmatism and problem solving,” she said. **Regardless** of Kerry’s record on Cuba policy in the Senate, **analysts say he will face several obstacles to major change, not least** of which **will be** the man likely to replace him as **chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Sen.** Bob **Menendez** (D-New Jersey), a Cuban American. If Menendez becomes chairman, then **the committee responsible for shaping US foreign policy** in the upper house **will be led by a hardliner who wants to ratchet up — not dial back** — **the US squeeze on Havana**. So while Kerry may have some latitude to adjust Cuba policy from inside the White House, **Latin America experts don’t expect** sweeping **change** — like an end to the Cuba Embargo — **which requires Congressional action.** “On Latin America, in general, I think Kerry has a longer and broader vision,” **said** Robert **Pastor, professor of international relations at American** University. **But when it comes to Cuba**, he cautioned, “**Kerry is also a political realist.”** “**Changing US policy is not a high priority** for him, **but not changing US policy is the only priority for Bob Menendez,” Pastor said.** In 2011, Kerry delayed the release of nearly $20 million in federal funds for pro-democracy Cuba projects run by the US Agency for International Development (USAID), questioning their effectiveness and insisting on greater oversight. “There is no evidence that the ‘democracy promotion’ programs, which have cost the US taxpayer more than $150 million so far, are helping the Cuban people,” Kerry said at the time. “Nor have they achieved much more than provoking the Cuban government to arrest a US government contractor.” The **US government contractor** is **Alan Gross, jailed on the island** since December 2009. Cuban authorities arrested Gross while he worked on a USAID project to set up satellite communications gear that would allow members of Cuba’s Jewish community to connect to the internet without going through government servers. Cuba **sentenced** him **to 15 years in prison**, but now says its willing to work out a prisoner swap for the “Cuban Five,” a group of intelligence agents who have been serving time in a US federal prison. The Obama administration has refused to negotiate, calling on Havana to release Gross unconditionally, and **even US lawmakers who advocate greater engagement with Cuba say no change will be possible as long as he’s in jail.** The Castro government insists it’s not willing to give up Gross for nothing. Carlos **Alzugaray**, a former Cuban diplomat and s**cholar of US-Cuba relations at the University of Havana, said a resolution** to the Gross case **and** other **significant changes in US policy would “require a big investment of political capital” by Kerry and Obama. “The question is if Kerry will be** willing and **able to convince Obama that he should push for change, and if they can neutralize Menendez**,” Alzugaray said. **“If that happens, then we will see change,” he said. “If not, it will be more of the same: minimal** and timid **changes but nothing big.”**

**Our Lobby, campaign contributions, GOP, Dem Unity, Filibuster, Committee, Menendez and Reid links outweigh every possible turn – empirics**

**LeoGrande, 12**

William M. LeoGrande School of Public Affairs American University, Professor of Government and a specialist in Latin American politics and U.S. foreign policy toward Latin America, Professor LeoGrande has been a frequent adviser to government and private sector agencies, 12/18/12, http://www.american.edu/clals/upload/LeoGrande-Fresh-Start.pdf

The 113th Congress **Congress has held a central role in U.S. policy toward Cuba** ever since it codified the U.S. embargo into law in the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act of 1996 (Helms-Burton). **To move** beyond limited improvements in relations on issues of mutual interest or limited commercial activity– that is, to move **toward** the full normalization of diplomatic and **economic relations**– **the president would have to win congressional approval to change the law**. In 2000, the Congress passed the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000, which legalized the sale of food products to Cuba, albeit on a cash-only basis, but at the same time prohibited tourist travel by U.S. residents. For the next four years, the bipartisan Cuba Working Group in the House of Representatives worked to end all prohibitions on travel to Cuba. In 2001, Jeff Flake (R-Ariz.), the founder along with Bill Delahunt (D-Mass.) of the Cuba Working Group, introduced an amendment to the Treasury appropriation bill prohibiting enforcement of the travel ban. The House approved it in July by a wide margin (240-186), but it was dropped in conference committee by the Republican House leadership in response to Bush’s veto threat. For the next three years, this scenario was replayed annually. The House (and the 27 Senate in 2003 and 2004) voted to end enforcement of the travel ban, but congressional Republicans conspired with the White House to prevent it from becoming law by repeatedly dropping the provision from the final bill. “People are wrong to underestimate what it means to have President Bush on our side,” Lincoln Diaz-Balart (R-Fla) said with satisfaction. By 2005, 28 a sense of futility had eroded the Cuba Working Group. **Aided by campaign contributions to key members of the House from the** new **pro-embargo U.S.-Cuba Democracy PAC, Republicans were able to defeat amendments easing restrictions** on travel **to Cuba and block consideration of others in 2005 and 2006**.29 **With** President **Obama promising** a **new** policy of **engagement toward Cuba** and having lifted travel restrictions on Cuban Americans in 2009, **freedom-to-travel advocates launched a new congressional campaign to lift the travel ban. With large Democratic majorities** in both the House and Senate**, hopes ran high for success**. Over 170 cosponsors quickly signed on in the House. **A broad coalition of** some 130 **business groups and foreign policy NGOs formed behind the campaign, including** the U.S. **Chamber of Commerce,** American **Farm Bureau** Federation, National Farmers Union, American Society of Travel Agents, Amnesty International, the **A**merican **C**ivil **Li**berties **U**nion, **and** the U.S. Conference of **Catholic Bishops**. The travel web site Orbitz collected over 100,000 signatures on a petition to lift the travel ban. **As a measure of its commitment, the Chamber of Commerce warned legislators** that **their vote on Cuba would be “scored” as a key business vote** included in the Chamber’s annual “How They Voted” scorecard.30 **Public opinion, even among Cuban-Americans, favored** the freedom to travel. A 2008 poll in south Florida by Florida International University found that 67% favored “ending current travel restrictions for all Americans.” A national poll of Cuban-Americans the following year by Bendixen and Associates found the same result, and a 2010 poll by a faculty member at the University of Miami found support at 64%. The general public’s view was even more lopsided: 31 70% favored unrestricted travel to Cuba, and even 62% of Republicans agreed.32 **Opponents blasted the** freedom-to-travel **coalition as** venial for **putting dollars ahead of human rights. Senator** Robert **Menendez** (D-NJ), who **pledged to filibuster** the bill if it ever got to the Senate, **denounced businessmen who “only care about padding their profits by opening up a new market,” even though it meant “enriching the Castro regime.” Congresswoman Ros** 33 **Lehtinen attacked proponents** of free travel **for,** “**seek[ing] to reward the Cuban regime with** tourism **cash flows** as the dictatorship tightens its stranglehold on the Cuban people.”34 **The legislative vehicle for opening travel and facilitating agricultural sales** was House Resolution (H.R.) 4645, the “Travel Restriction Reform and Export Enhancement Act,” cosponsored by House Agricultural Committee Chair Collin Peterson (D-Minn) and Jerry Moran (R-Kan.). It **cleared the Ag**ricultural **Committee** on July 1, 2010, **by a narrow** 25-20 **margin,** and was referred to the **Foreign Affairs Committee**. **For weeks**, Committee **Chair** Howard Berman (D-Calif.) **tried to collect the votes needed to report the bill out** to the House floor. In September, **still** one or two **votes short**, with Congress drawing to a close for the election campaign, **he gave up. The bill died in committee. The principal obstacle** faced by supporters of the travel bill **was not** the **opposition of Republicans like Ros-Lehtinen** and the Diaz-Balart brothers, **but opposition from moderate and conservative Democrats. In the Senate, not only did Menendez promise to block any travel bill, Majority Leader** Harry **Reid** (D-Nev) **also opposed** unfettered travel, **and he controlled the flow of legislation to the Senate floor. In the House,** Debbie Wasserman **Schultz, a rising star of the party** from south Florida, **took it upon herself to organize opposition** to the travel bill **within the Democratic caucus**. Wasserman Schultz was in charge of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee's “Red to Blue” project in the 2008 election cycle, aimed at unseating Republican incumbents (though not in south Florida, where Wasserman Schultz refused to campaign against her three Republican friends– Ros-Lehtinen and the Diaz-Balarts). **Many** freshman **Democrats– especially** those **from** relatively **conservative districts**– **were in her debt. A vote on Cuba, which was not a salient or popular issue in their constituencies, was a small price to pay** to stay in Wasserman Schultz’s good graces. When supporters of the travel bill first rolled it out with 178 cosponsors, Wasserman **Schultz recruited 53 House Democrats to write a letter to** Speaker Nancy **Pelosi declaring their determination to vote against it– a formidable number that foreshadowed a nasty battle inside the Democratic caucus** if the bill went to the House floor, **and put final passage in doubt. In 2011,** President **Obama selected** Wasserman **Schultz to chair the** **Democratic National Committee**

**Drains capital and outweighs every turn**

**Clemons and Kervick, ‘9**

Steve Clemons, Steve Clemons is Washington editor at large for The Atlantic and editor of Atlantic Live. He writes frequently about politics and foreign affairs.Clemons is a senior fellow and the founder of the American Strategy Program at the New America Foundation, a centrist think tank in Washington, D.C., where he previously served as executive vice president. He writes and speaks frequently about the D.C. political scene, foreign policy, and national security issues, as well as domestic and global economic-policy challenges.Dan Kervick, PhD, scholar specializing in philosophy, columnist @ New Economic Perspectives, 9/14/9, <http://washingtonnote.com/obama_undermine/>

President **Obama has missed** yet **another chance to pressure Congress** to end the self-inflicted damage of a “unilateral embargo” **against Cuba** and to take American foreign policy writ large in a new, more constructive direction. Today, the President officially extended the trade embargo against Cuba for another year — putting the US at odds again with roughly 183 nations that vote against the embargo each year in the United Nations. The President’s global mystique has been based on a perception that he would shift the Bush era **gravitational forces** in more constructive directions — that he would support engagement and exchange as tools of American foreign policy in order to try and get better outcomes in international affairs. But by continuing an embargo that undermines American interests and even US national security, he **chooses** the **continuity** of failure **over** the opportunity for **change** and over his own principles. By arguing that “he will not lift the embargo until Cuba undertakes democratic and economic reforms”, Obama is perpetuating a fallacy that conditionality produces results in Cuba’s domestic internal affairs. That approach has failed for decades — and needs to be dropped. The President has made some **progress on Cuba** — but **its mostly progress that the most hawkish, right wing elements** **of the Cuban-American community desired**, not progress that was based on the interests of the nation as a whole. Obama needs to fix his course on Cuba, or despite the modest creep forward recently — **helping a single class of ethnic Americans access Cuba but keeping up prohibition**s on other American citizens, he will be added to a long roster of Presidents who maintained a Cold War in the America’s backyard that is, as David Rothkopf called it, “the edsel” of US foreign policy. Cont… I think WigWag is basically right. However, Steve does make an important point. **As low a profile as Cuba might have for most Americans**, so that **the domestic downside can appear much higher for Obama than the domestic upside**, still Obama’s Cuba policy might affect his political capital abroad. Although I doubt Cuba is all that much more inherently important to people in other countries than it is here, it still might play an outsized role as a signal on a symbolic issue – one of those highlighted signals people are interpreting to determine whether the Obama administration represents any real change. To the extent that Obama is perceived as representing a mere continuation of existing policies, his ability to get things done abroad will be harmed. Cuba has a particular symbolic importance, because **it is** probably **the clearest case of** the tension between **foreign policy** rationality and **submission to domestic political entanglements and obligations**. People might look to Cuba as one important index of just how much power Obama has at home, and how much independence and rationality can be expected from him as he acts abroad.

**Turns not salient – Cuba lacks enough market size or national security importance**

**LeoGrande, 12**

William M. LeoGrande School of Public Affairs American University, Professor of Government and a specialist in Latin American politics and U.S. foreign policy toward Latin America, Professor LeoGrande has been a frequent adviser to government and private sector agencies, 12/18/12, http://www.american.edu/clals/upload/LeoGrande-Fresh-Start.pdf

Latin America Weighs In

Since the end of the cold war, **Cuba simply hasn't been very important to U.S. national**

**security or foreign relations.** Without its Soviet patron, **Cuba poses no threat to the U**nited **S**tates,

**and with just 11 million people, Cuba (unlike China or even Vietnam) doesn't offer much of a**

**market for U.S. exports. Nothing compels a president to re-examine policy toward Cuba, even**

**though that policy** has been an abject failure for decades-- **which is why relations with Cuba**

**became a domestic political issue driven by the Cuba Lobby, rather than a foreign policy issue.**

**drains PC and trades off with larger political priorities - powerful dem and GOP backlash, no momentum, Gross arrest, insistence on conditions, and flip flop**

**LeoGrande, 12**

William M. LeoGrande School of Public Affairs American University, Professor of Government and a specialist in Latin American politics and U.S. foreign policy toward Latin America, Professor LeoGrande has been a frequent adviser to government and private sector agencies, 12/18/12, http://www.american.edu/clals/upload/LeoGrande-Fresh-Start.pdf

After a long, nasty campaign in which the candidates and assorted super PACs spent upwards of $6 billion, voters re-elected President Barack Obama, increased the Democrats' control in the Senate by two seats, and left Republicans in control of the House, albeit by a smaller majority. Thus the **balance of power in Washington was not much changed by the 2012 election. It was logical** to conclude, **therefore, that U.S. policy toward Latin America, and Cuba in particular, might not change** dramatically in the second Obama administration. Four years earlier, President Obama took office promising a "new beginning" in U.S. relations with Cuba. During the 2008 campaign, he acknowledged that 50 years of the policy of hostility had failed, and argued that it was time to try something new. During his first term, he expanded people-to-people programs significantly, not just reversing the restrictions placed on them by President George W. Bush in 2003 and 2004, but going beyond what President Bill Clinton had put in place in 1998-1999. Obama lifted virtually all restrictions on Cuban-American travel and remittances in 2009, and then expanded educational travel in 2011, restoring the broad people-to-people category that Bush had abolished.1 But the Obama administration made very little headway in expanding government-togovernment ties with Cuba. It resumed the semi-annual immigration consultations Bush had suspended, but then suspended them again in January 2011. Initial talks on counter-narcotics cooperation, joint medical assistance to Haiti, and Coast Guard search and rescue seemed to offer some promise of progress, but they stalled before reaching any new agreements. Only talks on cooperation to mitigate oil spills in the Caribbean made any real progress, and even then Washington insisted on conducting them multilaterally rather than bilaterally. **The proximate cause of the failure to move** bilateral relations **ahead was the arrest of** USAID subcontractor Alan **Gross** in December 2009. **But there were deeper causes for the loss of momentum in Obama's new Cuba policy.** One was the **low priority** given to it **in the face of the multiple** foreign **policy problems facing the president**– wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, nuclear proliferation in Iran and North Korea, revolutions sweeping North Africa. Even in Latin America, the administration faced more pressing problems– the coup in Honduras, drug war in Mexico, and earthquake in Haiti. Another reason for the lose of momentum was the **political resistance the president faced in Congress, not just from** Florida **Republicans** like Ileana RosLehtinen and Mario Diaz-Balart, **but from powerful Democrats like Senator** Robert **Menendez** (NJ) **and Congresswoman** Debbie Wasserman **Schultz** (Fla.). **Nor was Obama willing to make the** dramatic **change in policy direction** that his campaign promises seemed to portend. He continued funding the "democracy promotion" programs Bush had funded lavishly, including one to create an independent, satellite-based digital network in Cuba, outside the government's control– the project that got Alan Gross arrested. More fundamentally, **Obama adopted the** basic **outlook of every U.S. president** since George H. W. Bush– **that Cuba would have to change its political and economic system before the U**nited **S**tates **would change** its **policy in any fundamental way**. Consequently, for the last three years, **U.S. policy has been essentially frozen** as regards state-to-state relations. Has anything changed that would lead us to expect that U.S. policy will be any different in the next four years? The Presidential Campaign **Cuba has been an issue in U.S. elections with surprising frequency**– certainly more often than any other Latin American country. In 1960, John F. Kennedy pilloried Vice-President Richard Nixon, blaming the Eisenhower administration for having lost Cuba. In the 1962 midterm campaign, Republicans turned the tables, attacking Kennedy for allowing a Soviet military buildup on the island, only to have Kennedy trump their argument in October by ending the Missile Crisis with the withdrawal of Soviet missiles. In 1976, challenging President Gerald Ford for the Republican nomination, Ronald Reagan criticized Ford for not doing more to keep Cuban troops from intervening in Angola. Four years later, Reagan blasted President Jimmy Carter for failing to force the Soviets to withdraw their so-called "combat brigade" from Cuba and for his inability to halt the Mariel refugee crisis. "Carter couldn't get the Russians to move out of Cuba," Reagan quipped, "so he's moving out the Cubans."2 In the 1992 campaign, Bill Clinton tried to outflank President George H. W. Bush on the right by endorsing the Cuban Democracy Act (know as the Torricelli bill, for sponsor Congressman Robert Torricelli, D-NJ), which Bush had opposed because its extraterritorial provisions would inflame U.S. relations with Latin American and European allies. Clinton's endorsement of the law forced Bush to flip-flop and sign the bill into law. Four years later, Clinton signed the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act (**Helms-Burton), surrendering to Congress presidential authority over policy toward Cuba**, but strengthening Clinton's prospects among Cuban-American voters in the upcoming election. In 2000, however, the Clinton administration's decision to return six year old Elián González to his father in Cuba doomed Vice-President Al Gore's chances of a decent showing among Cuban-American voters in Florida. He lost the state and the election to George W. Bush by 537 votes. Four years later, Bush himself was the target of criticism from those same voters for not doing enough to keep his pledge to bring about regime change on the island, leading him to tighten regulations limiting travel and family remittances.

**Turns only prove a big fight – even minor increases in economic engagement with Cuba links**

**Spadoni and Sagebien ‘13**

[Paolo Spadoni , assistant professor in the Department of Political Science at Augusta State& Julia Sagebien, associate professor at the School of Business Administration and an adjunct professor in the International Development Studies program in the College of Sustainability at Dalhousie University, Canada Will They Still Love Us Tomorrow? Canada-Cuba Business Relations and the End of the US Embargo, Thunderbird International Business Review, Volume 55, Issue 1, pages 77–93, January/February 2013, http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/tie.21524/full]

Although Fidel Castro's definitive exit from the scene, and a Cuban government led by someone other than Raúl Castro, would speed up **a relaxation of the embargo**, such process **will mostly depend on** US **domestic dynamics. The embargo has survived** the end of the Cold War **primarily as a domestic electoral issue linked to the role the US-based Cuban exile community has played in helping determine the electoral outcome of important swing states** such as Florida and New Jersey. **Cuban-American lobbying and hefty campaign contributions were additional key factors** (Eckstein, 2009, pp. 127–132; Haney & Vanderbush, 2005, p. 72; Rich Kaplowitz, 1998, p. 134). **What Cuban-Americans think and feel matters.** They were relatively receptive or at least not outright hostile to Obama's early remarks on Cuba and welcomed the lifting of restrictions on their travel and money transfers to the island. The Cuban American National Foundation (CANF) fully supported the president's decision to increase this kind of people-to-people exchange (CANF, 2009). Moreover, **US opinion polls show considerable backing for a further easing of sanctions that are considered anachronistic and ineffective**, even by many Cuban-Americans.4 **Washington's Cuba policy has recently been going through a strident debate in Congress, where a series of bipartisan legislative proposals** **aimed to chip away at** various aspects of **the embargo are under consideration**. **Yet, pro-embargo forces**, **among them Cuban-American legislators and other members of the congressional group Cuba Democracy Caucus**, **will not go down without a fight**, **as demonstrated by their strenuous opposition to the aforementioned bills and their attempts to set rules for travel and remittances** to Cuba back to what they were under former President George W. Bush.5

**On balance link outweighs turns**

**Ratliff, 13**

William Ratliff (Research Fellow Hoover Institute), 1/30/13, http://www.hoover.org/publications/defining-ideas/article/139281

Since the early 1990s U.S. “proactive” policies have done more to stoke than reduce domestic tensions in Cuba, though we profess to seek a “peaceful transition.” **Most U.S. legislators have supported pro-embargo Cuban-Americans even though** Gallup **polls have long shown** that **most Americans favor** diplomatic relations with Havana and **lifting the embargo. On balance, politicians don’t think Cuba policy is important enough to be worth stirring up the hornets in the still fairly militant and well-financed pro-embargo lobby. Not only have all presidential candidates** including Obama **supported the embargo, most have resisted even seriously discussing it.**

**Opposition forces are powerful and more intense – your turns smoke drugs**

**Brush, 13**

Michael Brush is the editor of Brush Up on Stocks, an investment newsletter, MSN Money, 1/22/13, <http://money.msn.com/investing/time-to-invest-in-cuba?page=2>

"Now, more than ever, the pieces are falling into place where the embargo could be lifted this year," maintains Herzfeld. Why now? **Herzfeld cites** President Barack **Obama's view** **that economic relations with Cuba should be liberalized** -- **and** the president's **greater freedom** to pursue this goal **now that the election is behind** him. Herzfeld points to **the nomination of** Sen. of John **Kerry,**D-mass., who shares this view, to lead the State Department, as well as to steps by Cuba to improve human rights, such as the recent loosening of travel restrictions for Cubans. Then there's the shaky health of Cuban dictator Fidel Castro, whose demise could lead to big changes. "I believe if he were to die, that would be the single event that would led to the lifting of the embargo," says Herzfeld. A possible leadership transition in Venezuela, which we'll get to in a moment, could also be a factor in the embargo coming down. **Cuban experts** I surveyed **don't think much of Herzfeld's theory. "It won't happen anytime soon," predicts** Ted **Piccone,** a **senior fellow and deputy director for foreign policy at** the **Brookings** Institution. Riordan **Roett, the director of the Latin American Studies Program at** the **Johns Hopkins** School of Advanced International Studies, **puts it more bluntly: "What's he smoking?"** **Cuba experts cite two main obstacles.** First, the embargo is **in place because of** a law passed by **Congress**, which **Obama can't just overturn** on his own. Next, **Cuban-American congressional leaders, who have a big say, strongly oppose any change. Top among them: Sen**. Robert **Menendez**, D-N.J., who may be **taking over the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; Rep.** Ileana **Ros-Lehtinen**, R-Fla., **former chair**woman **of** the **House Foreign Affairs** Committee; **and Sen**. Marco **Rubio**, R-Fla. **"They are just not going to budge on this," says Roett**.

**Drains capital despite political gains for pro-cuba engagement forces**

**Bolender, 12**

Keith Bolender is a Research Fellow at the Council on Hemispheric Affairs (COHA) and author of Voices from the Other Side, An Oral History of Terrorism against Cuba (Pluto Press 2010) and Cuba Under Siege, 11/7/12, http://www.boloblog.com/index.php/articles

So now **Obama** has four more years, his **second** and final **term** and that always **brings speculation** that **he is** more **free to do things he** just **couldn’t afford to politically in the first** term. And **that could mean Cuba.** But **don’t hold your breath. He is still beholding to the economic and political influences that maintain the** ridiculous **policy** of siege **against Cuba, and it is doubtful he will expend much political capital to change that**. Since the passing of Helms Burton Act in 1996 **the continuation of** embargo and travel **restrictions has** been **moved to Congress**, and while the president does have extensive ability to legislatively slice up the blockade, it’s in Congress where real change really rests. **And** while the **Republicans hold the House**, the Democrats retained and increased their hold in the Senate. **In the final two years of the Obama term, if the Democrats regain the House, then maybe there might be a chance** to have Congress move again to end the travel restrictions. After that it would not take long for the embargo to be dismantled. That possibility moved a little step closer in this past election, when hard right Cuban-American Republican Rep. David Rivera was kicked out after one term amid accusations of ethics violations, as he lost to Democrat Joe Garcia. The Florida Ethics Commission found probable cause last month that Rivera committed 11 ethics laws violations while a state lawmaker. Garcia is the first Democratic Cuban-American to be elected to Congress. He has publicly stated a desire for **engagement** with Cuba. He **represents the more moderate position of the Cuban-American political side** towards their homeland. So that does add a more reasoned voice. **What is needed is the** continuation, the **voting out of some of the other radicals like Ros-Lehtinen. If that happens in 2014 then the chance** of **finally** normalizing relations with Cuba **increases**. The other good news is the fact that Obama won 47 per cent of the Cuban-American vote in Florida , even higher than he received in 2004. That indicates the new Cuban-Americans are shifting attitudes towards engagement, and see the Democratic party as the one to support in order to achieve that end. It is also indicating that the Cuban-American community can not longer be described as stanchly Republican, and that if the voting trends continues more moderate representatives will be elected, and that could be the most direct route to ending the travel restrictions and embargo. Which makes it more important to start ignoring **the extremist views in Congress regarding Cuba**, and to take Obama's numbers in the Cuban-American community as a sign to begin the process of real engagement with Cuba. Understandably, **Obama has a lot on his plate, and Cuba is not a priority**. There may be some anticipation that in his second term he will make the effort to tell Congress it’s time for a movement towards normalization with Cuba, and that Congress will respond positively. One can only hope. For change.

**Powerful political opposition and nearly zero support**

**Goodman, 13**

Joshua Goodman, Bloomberg reporter responsible for economic and political coverage in Latin America, 2/20, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-02-20/obama-should-bend-cuba-embargo-to-buoy-free-markets-reports-say.html

President Barack **Obama should** break free of the embargo on Cuba and assert his authority to **promote a free-market** overhaul taking place on the communist island. The recommendation is contained in concurrent reports to be published today by the Cuba Study Group and the Council of the Americas, two groups seeking to end a decades-old deadlock on U.S. policy **toward Cuba.** Among steps Obama can take without violating sanctions passed by Congress are opening U.S. markets, as well as authorizing the sale of American goods and services, to the estimated 400,000 private entrepreneurs that have arisen since Cuban President Raul Castro started cutting state payrolls in 2011. The reports also recommend allowing U.S. credit card and insurance companies to provide basic financial services to licensed U.S. travelers to Cuba. “We’ve been sitting on the sidelines with our hands tied by an antiquated law that’s being too strictly interpreted,” said Chris Sabatini, an author of the report and senior policy director for the Council of the Americas, a business-backed group based in New York. “There’s more **Obama can** do to **be a catalyst** for meaningful economic change.” Obama in 2009 allowed companies for the first time to provide communications services to the Caribbean island of 11 million and lifted a travel ban for Cuban-Americans. The loosening of restrictions, while heralded by the White House as a way to undermine the Castro government’s control of information, was seen as insufficient by potential investors including Verizon Communications Inc. and AT&T Inc. Economic Overhaul Now, in a second term, and with private business expanding in Cuba, Obama has a freer hand to do more, said Sabatini. An exception to the embargo allowing U.S. businesses and consumers to trade with non-state enterprises in Cuba would be small in scale though help empower a growing, viable constituency for change on the island, he said. Since his brother Fidel started handing over power in 2006, Castro has relaxed state control of the economy in the biggest economic overhaul since the 1959 revolution. To provide jobs for the 1 million state workers being laid off, the government began allowing the buying and selling of homes and the creation of farming co-operatives and other private businesses. The latest sign of change are new rules that took effect in January allowing most Cubans to bypass requirements they obtain an exit visa or invitation from abroad to leave the island. Castro in December said that he hopes that productivity gains will boost economic growth this year to at least 3.7 percent. Gross domestic product expanded 3.1 percent in 2012. Repeal Legislation The Washington-based Cuba Study Group urges Obama to gain even more leverage by getting Congress to repeal the so-called **Helms-Burton** act of 1996 **and other legislation** that **conditions the easing of sanctions** on regime change. **Any move to ease the** five-decade-old **embargo would** probably **encounter anti-Castro resistance in Florida**, one of the biggest prizes in recent presidential elections**, and opposition from key lawmakers including Senator** Robert **Menendez, the Democratic chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee**. **A bill introduced** by Representative Jose Serrano, a New York Democrat, in the 112th Congress **to dismantle** the web of **legislation governing relations with Cuba** since as early as the 1960s **received no co-sponsors**. **Another obstacle** to an improvement in relations **is** the fate of **U.S. contractor** Alan **Gross, who remains jailed in** a **Havana** prison three years after he was arrested on charges of spying for carrying telecommunications equipment to the island. A delegation of U.S. lawmakers led by Senator Patrick Leahy, a Democrat from Vermont, is in Cuba this week and is expected to meet with Gross and seek his immediate release.

**Lobby, campaign contributions and dem unity links**

**LeoGrande, 12**

William M. LeoGrande School of Public Affairs American University, Professor of Government and a specialist in Latin American politics and U.S. foreign policy toward Latin America, Professor LeoGrande has been a frequent adviser to government and private sector agencies, 12/18/12, http://www.american.edu/clals/upload/LeoGrande-Fresh-Start.pdf

**Money played a role** as well. **The U.S. Cuba Democracy PAC handed out** $2.2 million in **campaign contributions** up through the 2010 election cycle. **Conservatives associated with the group gave another $9 million individually** or through Lincoln Diaz-Balart’s Democracy Believers PAC. Beginning with the 2006 election cycle, these **donors directed their money increasingly to Democratic candidates**– from just 29% in 2004 to 43% in 2006, 59% in 2008, and 76% in 2010 (despite the Republicans’ success in the 2010 mid-terms). **The impact was immediately apparent. In 2007, the House voted down** (245-182), **a proposal** by Charlie Rangel (D-NY) **to relax restrictions on Cuban purchases of food** from the United States. **Of the 66 Democrats voting against, 52 had received money from the U.S. Cuba Democracy PAC**. The PAC focused special attention on freshmen members, often contributing to their campaigns as challengers. Of the 22 Democratic freshman it funded, 17 voted against Rangel. **PAC money** 37 also **changed votes; seventeen House members who received contributions** from the PAC **switched from being consistent supporters of measures to relax sanctions on Cuba, to opposing them. Of the 53 Democrats who signe**d Wasserman **Schultz’s letter to** Nancy **Pelosi opposing** travel **liberalization, 51 were recipients of the U.S.- Cuba Democracy PAC’s largesse**.38

**Plan costs massive PC and no turns because supporters have already been sufficiently appeased**

**Clemons, ‘9**

Steve Clemons, Steve Clemons is Washington editor at large for The Atlantic and editor of Atlantic Live. He writes frequently about politics and foreign affairs.Clemons is a senior fellow and the founder of the American Strategy Program at the New America Foundation, a centrist think tank in Washington, D.C., where he previously served as executive vice president. He writes and speaks frequently about the D.C. political scene, foreign policy, and national security issues, as well as domestic and global economic-policy challenges, 4/13/9, <http://washingtonnote.com/obama_makes_fir/>

Big announcement made today via White House Spokesman Robert Gibbs and National Security Council Latin America Director Dan Restrepo **on** the new parameters of **America’s “Cuba Policy**.” So. . .let’s get the easy part of this comment out of the way. Applause, applause, applause. . .for a decent set of humanitarian gestures in the US-Cuba relationship that don’t actually make things worse. Obama and his team have moved us in the right direction — and moving in the right direction on Cuba is something that rarely happens when Presidents and their advisers look at electoral maps and get nervous about South Florida. So, bravo for a bit of good news. The Obama administration today lifted restrictions on travel and remittances for Cuban-Americans and eased restrictions on US telecommunications firms entering into network agreements with Cuban telecom firms in a broad range of communications services as well as easing restrictions on humanitarian donations to Cubans. Only problem with today’s announcement — beyond the very friendly nudge about Dan Restrepo’s impressive Castilian accent that may not play too well to many in the Cuban-American community — is that it is not “a lot of good news.” I have always disliked over-tilting to any class of “other nationality-Americans” when it came to dealing with political and economic policies dealing with their home, or preceding, countries of origin. **Ethnic politics are a reality** in this country — but all people in this nation regardless of origin have as much right to argue about the terms of US foreign policy writ large. And I feel that no voices should be privileged over others. Our President and our Congress should be crafting foreign policies with other sovereign states that fit the preferences and interests of most Americans, not a sub-class of them. But today, remarkably, our nation’s first African-American **President** has just issued executive **orders** that **create preferences** and opportunities **for a specific class of ethnic Americans**. Even if a good step on one level, at a macro level, **this** sort of **cynical gaming of domestic politics** at the expense of broader national interests is fundamentally wrong. President **Obama inherited** the **perverse** economic and **political realities created by fifty years of** a **dysfunctional** US-Cuba **relationship** and failed embargo and has to deal within the confines of the Helms-Burton Act **and other legislation** that is not his fault. But what was interesting in today’s announcement was the fact that his envoys for making today’s announcement — Gibbs and Dan Restrepo — gave no indication that the President felt uneasy issuing executive orders removing all restrictions for Cuban-Americans but not addressing the travel rights of all other classes of American citizens. I want to give credit to Dan Restrepo saying that today’s policy was a starting point — before Gibbs cut him off. So, applause for the Cuban-American oriented efforts. Better than nothing — but not nearly enough. And the precedent is worrisome and disconcerting. We did not open up relations with Vietnam by restricting travel to Vietnamese-Americans. We really should not be doing this with Cuba either. What is happening is that Barack Obama has started the ball moving forward — and is opening up something he knows many will find completely unacceptable and discriminatory. Separate is not equal — and that is what Barack Obama’s team has just moved forward. On the much more positive side, President Obama is easing restrictions on telecommunications providers to allow roaming service agreements for cell phone calls and other transmissions. This matches some of the liberalization on cell phone and other video and dvd equipment liberalization that Raul Castro has already enacted. **Obama** has also eased up restrictions on humanitarian gifts and packages to Cuba — which was really needed after the recent devastating hurricanes this past year. Humanitarian relief has been something we should have eased long ago — and this was a good step. Now, my hunch is that Rahm Emanuel and David Axelrod **see that they have “done enough” to check off the boxes for what they have promised the right wing, moderates, and even left wing of the Cuban-American community that felt collectively strangled by the tightness of** the Bush administration **restrictions.** What **Obama** foreign policy strategists Denis McDonough and Mark Lippert are probably thinking — and I have reason to suspect that McDonough in particular has had leverage and significant involvement in the just released policy — is that they have now started something that **Congress and others are going to have to vigorously fight to move forward**. The **Obama** administration **never intended to carry all of the water on** completely changing **the US-Cuba relationship** into something that makes 21st century sense — but they are telegraphing — or Denis McDonough is in my view — that **the White House is** perhaps **willing to work with Congress** to move this into territory that Obama has not yet committed to and did not express support for during the campaign. McDonough, if I am reading this correctly, is smart in unveiling America’s Cuba strategy this way. He has probably given his assent to Rahm Emanuel’s south Florida pandering as a first step **in a broader struggle** — and hopefully a somewhat slippery slide — into a more rational national security position with Latin America. Obama has made his “first move” **in** what is essentially a **negotiation with** both **Congress** and the Cuban government **and Latin American region.**

**Election politics mean GOP will never cave despite turns**

**McElvaine, 11** (Robert, Elizabeth Chisholm Professor of Arts and Letters and Chair of the Department of History at Millsaps College, author of ten books, including The Great Depression, Mario Cuomo, What's Left?—A New Democratic Vision for America, and Eve's Seed: Biology, the Sexes and the Course of History. He has written scores of articles and op eds for the New York Times, Washington Post, Wall Street Journal, Los Angeles Times, and many others. His latest book is Grand Theft Jesus: The Hijacking of Religion in America (Crown). la times, 9/8, <http://articles.latimes.com/2011/sep/08/opinion/la-oe-mcelvaine-cuba-20110908>)

**Who wants the embargo**? **Practically no one beyond** a small number of **Cuban Americans in the Miami area. It exists today** only **because Florida is the largest swing state and Republicans believe, probably correctly, that they are unlikely to win its 29 electoral votes without strong support from this special-interest group**.

**Link outweighs – embargo advocates have more influence than the plan’s supporters**

**Karon 10** – senior editor at TIME (Tony, 04/21, “Do We Really Need an Embargo Against Cuba?” http://www.time.com/time/arts/article/0,8599,48773,00.html)

And that has prompted a growing movement in the corridors of power to reconsider the policy. Once the preserve of dedicated liberals and lefties, **opposition to the U.S. embargo on Cuba these days is an ever-expanding tent. The recent congressional effort to relax aspects of the embargo was led by farm-state Republicans and echoed a growing consensus even inside the GOP.** The National Bipartisan Commission on Cuba, whose calls for a comprehensive review of U.S. policy have thus far been rebuffed by President Clinton, includes not only 16 GOP Senators (and eight Democrats), but also some of the GOP foreign policy heavyweights lined up by the Bush campaign, including former Secretaries of State Kissinger, Schultz and Eagleburger. And that's hardly surprising, since ending the embargo has long been advocated by groupings as diverse as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Vatican and, reportedly, the bulk of democracy activists still living in Cuba. While previous embargoes of countries such as Iran and Iraq have had the support of most of the industrialized world, the only country consistently backing Washington's Cuba policy is Israel. **Yet, despite the burgeoning opposition, advocates of the embargo continue to hold sway with the leadership of both parties on Capitol Hill, and with both presidential candidates.** Elian's enduiring legacy, however, may be that he reopened a national debate in the U.S. on the future of Cuba policy.

**Plan guarantees congressional backlash and controversy**

**Hanson and Lee 13** (Stephanie, associate director and coordinating editor at CFR.org, Brianna, Senior Production Editor, 01/31, “U.S.-Cuba Relations,” http://www.cfr.org/cuba/us-cuba-relations/p11113)

**Many recent policy reports have recommended that the United States take some unilateral steps to roll back sanctions on Cuba.** The removal of sanctions, however, would be just one step in the process of normalizing relations. **Such a process is sure to be controversial, as indicated by the heated congressional debate spurred in March 2009 by attempts to ease travel and trade restrictions in a large appropriations bill. "Whatever we call it--normalization, détente, rapproachement--it is clear that the policy process risks falling victim to the politics of the issue," says Sweig.**

**General link/A2: Business and Ag lobbies turns**

**Link outweighs turn – even business and ag lobby supporters aren’t focused and wont push hard**

**Thornton 12**

Chester Thornton CEO & President, Gulf Coast Merchants and Trading International, Former member department of commerce District Export Council, <http://chipsball.hubpages.com/hub/Best-Foreign-Markets-for-US-Consumer-Goodsclose-and-within-reach>, 8/31/12

**For U.S. exporters**, U.S. **agricultural groups, lobbyist, businesses**, and international trade groups the discussions must continue with mounting calls for the removal of the economic sanctions now growing and therefore those protestations cannot be stifled much longer. I know, **nothing can possibly change** until after the 2012 presidential elections. Lifting the trade embargo against **Cuba would be such a provocative issue in this political climate that any reasonable or attractive deviation from current U.S. policy is...dreaming... even considering the** positive jolt it would give to the **U.S. economy. Those** in favor of the embargo and who **insist** they remain in place simply believe that **trading** with the Castro regime (at the time) **would strengthen** his **hand** by **suppressing** his **opposition and** he would **continue human rights abuses** they claim are prevalent. They say that the trade should only occur after Cuba makes significant reforms both economically and politically. A different point of view occurs when those who favor lifting the embargo insist that the sanctions imposed by our government actually assist the Cuba government by bringing solitarity to the people living within a communist government. Many note that the Cuban people suffer because trade sanctions deny them access to basic necessities like food, medicine and consumer products readily available from the U.S. Many also note we do considerable business with China a communist country and that after 20 years of economic reform, China has become one of the leading trade partners for the U.S. Due to China's reforms, 100 million people no longer live below the poverty line...Cuba could see such a positive change in the everyday lives of its people if sanctions were removed...some believe. Most find that U.S. economic policy towards Cuba in the form of this embargo has failed and is no longer an effective use of our international influence and leverage. U.S. companies on losing end? Let's look at the numbers. Cuba's population of 12 million is in need of everything...no kidding. There are foreign firms who are filling the gap by offering products that meet those many basic needs. A Texas A & M study commissioned by the Cuba Policy Foundation showed that U.S. farmers lose $1.24 billion each year due to the embargo. In addition, lifting the sanctions would generate an additional $1.6 billion in U.S. GDP, $2.8 billion in sales and 32,000+ jobs...did we say JOBS? One of the main reasons why sanctions should be weakened is because of the positive impact it would have on the struggling U.S. economy. From strictly practical and economic reason it would make perfect sense. Free-trade with Cuba has the potential by everyone's estimation would earn the United States billions of dollars. Why should Cuba continue to buy goods from China, Japan and European competitors to the U.S. The question of the lifting of the sanctions should be a discussion during debates from our presidential candidates. Do they favor continuation of the embargo? Would they promote a change of policy and a lifting of sanctions without preconditions? I would like to know where they stand on this issue...some U.S. businesses would like to know as well. **Cuba & U.S policy**. may be changing... Lifting the trade embargo **is a very difficult and complex issue to debate and attempt to reconcile**. This I know. With the world moving towards free-trade and economic development, Cuba like China is attempting to include itself in those capitalistic experiments that provide advantages for its people, but not so as to negate their ability to maintain controls over the trends that naturally flow from these reforms economically and politically. Cuba appears poised for reforms both politically and economically...perhaps lifting the embargo would nudge them further along. Cuba represents an untapped human resource for American businesses (at least pre-Casto revolution). Cuba's excellent educational systems has created highly qualified and skilled workers. Yet, Cuba's poor economic situation has led Cuban workers to be the lowest paid in the western hemisphere. Use of Cuban labor would allow U.S. businesses to save money on some labor cost while also saving on shipping products into the country. This must however be balanced against any displacement of U.S. jobs into the country. What's next? I don't know. **We are** so **reluctant and scared** to some extent, **to even bring up the subject**. **Most U.S. businesses don't know how they should express their sentiments towards** lifting **the embargo therefore meaningful discussions and debate are rare.** I attended **a U.S. trade conference** in Washington, D.C. **and** the topic of **trading with Cuba was listed on the agenda**. I eagerly awaited some definitive dialogue...**the results...an announcement that no discussion of business relations would be forthcoming and that the only issues relating to Cuba would be limited to the requirements** under the embargo **and penalties** that could be **imposed for violations** of the sanctions enacted by the U.S. government.

**Drains capital – despite ag lobby - turns aren’t salient or high priority but our links are**

**Fortner, 12**

Melissa Lockhart Fortner is Senior External Affairs Officer at the Pacific Council on International Policy and Cuba blogger at the Foreign Policy Association, CSM, 8/17/12, http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Americas/Latin-America-Monitor/2012/0817/What-will-Ryan-s-position-on-Cuba-be-as-Romney-campaign-hits-Florida

What will Ryan's position on Cuba be as Romney campaign hits Florida? Paul Ryan has a track **record on Cuba** that **is likely to frustrate the politically powerful Cuban-American community**. Mitt Romney and Paul Ryan will spend this weekend campaigning in Florida, long a power player in the realm of swing states. Representative Ryan’s success there will depend mainly upon his appeal to two voting groups: seniors and Hispanics. This includes the Cuban-American community. Following the announcement of Ryan as Romney’s running mate and a media flurry to delve the depths of who Ryan is and what policies can be expected of him, it quickly became clear that by bringing on Paul Ryan, the Romney campaign sought to clearly define the presidential race as a referendum on economic issues – the debt, financial regulation, taxes, the budget. Ryan did not have much in the way of foreign policy experience, it seemed. But in fact, Ryan has a track record on Cuba that will largely frustrate an otherwise dependably Republican Cuban-American base in Florida: he has been an opponent of the US embargo on Cuba, **standing up against the standard party line on the issue.** The liberal journalist Jim Fallows (of the Atlantic) even goes so far as to call him “brave” on Cuba policy. Yet **as a congressional representative from the Midwest, where trade with Cuba directly benefits the agricultural sector, taking such a stand is far easier** to do than it is when standing before a Cuban-American voting bloc. RELATED: Think you know Latin America? Take our geography quiz. … Or Cuban-American colleagues, it turns out. In 2002, Ryan told the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel: “The embargo doesn’t work. It is a failed policy. It was probably justified when the Soviet Union existed and posed a threat through Cuba. I think it’s become more of a crutch for Castro to use to repress his people. All the problems he has, he blames the American embargo.” In another interview in 2008, he asked: “if we’re going to have free trade with China, why not Cuba?” But a statement from Republican Rep. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen now says that Ryan more recently spent time with Cuban-American representatives in order to learn “the true nature of the Castro regime, and unlike the Obama-Biden administration, which has appeased and emboldened the Castro regime, the Cuba policy of a Romney-Ryan administration will be clear: no accommodation, no appeasement. A Romney-Ryan administration will place maximum sanctions pressure on the regime and support the brave pro-democracy movement on the island.” The switch could have caused some whiplash if it were not so completely predictable from a campaign standpoint. **There’s little political capital gained** on a Republican ticket **from taking an anti-embargo stance, and there’s a critical voting base that would be turned off** by it. Meanwhile, **there’s nothing politically risky** for Republicans **about sticking to the hard-line stance on Cuba**. In the end, it’s not likely that any of this will matter much once the campaign is over, even if the Romney-Ryan team wins. Romney is not likely to bother reversing Obama administration changes to travel and remittances, which have been received mostly positively by the American public, and Ryan has no reason (nor past precedent) to push for such a reversal. There are **too many global challenges** that **will take precedence over attention to Cuba policy, as they always do.** But for now, and for this weekend, Romney and Ryan had better stick to script.

**Six reasons plan Drains Obama capital despite changing cuban sentiment, business, and ag support**

* Committee opposition
* Powerful pro embargo lobby and campaign contributions
* Both house and senate oppose
* Filibuster swamps even majority support
* Empirics prove outweighs turns
* Obama push/PC drain is normal means – can’t overcome opposition without it

**Padgett, 10** (Tim, Latin America Bureau Chief @ Time Magazine last 14 years, 8/23, <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,2013820,00.html>)

Will the White House Fight to End the Cuba Travel Ban? After it looked a couple of months ago as if **a bill lifting** the **ban on** U.S. **travel** to Cuba had the momentum to pass Congress, it now appears **stalled** in the House of Representatives. **The bill, which** would also **make food sales to Cuba easier, cleared the** House **Agr**iculture Committee **but still needs** a **vote in two other committees** — Financial Services and Foreign Affairs — and **it may not even come up for** a full **vote** this year. So as reports surface that the Obama Administration plans on its own to expand legal travel opportunities to Cuba, the question is whether such a move will spur or spoil the House bill — whose passage would mark the biggest shift in U.S. Cuba policy since a trade embargo was issued against the communist island in 1962. President Obama, according to Administration and congressional sources, intends before the year is out to loosen restrictions on visits to Cuba by U.S. students, entertainers and other goodwill ambassadors. Backers of increased American engagement with Cuba applaud the proposal, which is part of the President's executive prerogative under the embargo. In reality, the action would simply be taking U.S. policy back to the Clinton Administration, before former President George W. Bush all but froze that kind of people-to-people contact with Cuba. But **it's less clear if Obama intends** his new regulations to be a signal of support for eliminating the entire travel ban — which only Congress can do — or an unspoken message that this is as far as he wants **to take the battle against the embargo's dogged supporters on Capitol Hill**. The bill's bipartisan backers, not surprisingly, see it as the former. House staffers say the White House Cuba regulations will be a shot in the arm for the broader travel legislation when Congress returns from its recess next month. Embargo foes agree. "This is the Administration essentially saying, 'We've done what we can, and now we want Congress to take the larger step,'" says Jake Colvin, vice president for global trade issues at the independent National Foreign Trade Council in Washington, D.C. "**This bill** still **has a lot of hurdles**, but this implicit White House support gives it momentum again." Echoing the optimism is Patrick Kilbride, senior director for the Americas at the U.S. **Chamber of Commerce**. The organization represents a sizable bloc of **farmers and businesspeople**, many of them Republican-aligned, who **want the** Cuba **embargo scrapped** so they can reap the $1 billion in annual sales to the island that a recent Texas A&M University study says they're losing out on. "We think these new [travel] steps are a very positive signal that the [Administration] would like to move forward" to lift the full travel ban, says Kilbride. He also confirms that the chamber is considering scoring the votes of Representatives and Senators if and when the bill finally hits their floors. **The House bill seems slowed at this point by more serious opposition from the chamber's pro-embargo forces and especially the pro-embargo lobby, led by the US-Cuba Democracy PAC, a major contributor to congressional campaigns. The Senate version,** which deals only with the travel ban, **has yet to get a Foreign Relations Committee vote and most likely faces a filibuster from pro-embargo Senators if it can ever get to the full chamber**. (See pictures of Fidel Castro's years in power.) But another reason to be confident, says Colvin, is that "this is the best diplomatic environment we've seen in a long time" for dismantling the embargo. That's because last month, Cuban President Raúl Castro, after a dissident hunger striker died earlier this year, released 52 political prisoners who were locked up in 2003 by his elder brother, then President Fidel Castro (who ceded power to Raúl in 2006 due to ill health). Obama last year had left the ball in Havana's court when he reversed his predecessor's policy and let Cuban Americans travel and send remittances more freely to Cuba. Raúl's prisoner release, say diplomats, **now makes the next move Obama's**, and many see his new travel regulations as part of that. But it's doubtful the Castros will feel international pressure to reciprocate, with further democratic or economic openings in Cuba, unless the travel ban that's been in place since 1963 is eradicated. **Proponents** of doing just that **insist there's more consensus than ever in the U.S. to ditch the Cuba embargo** and its travel ban, which, after almost 50 years, have utterly failed to dislodge the Castro regime. Opening Cuba to Americans, they believe, will do more to stimulate democratization there than isolating it has. **Even a majority of Cuban Americans now agree. Still, for all the good vibes the bill's backers feel from the White House** right now, some note warily that **Obama has been loath to spend political capital in Cuba, or the rest of Latin America for that matter**. Critics, for example, point to his decision last year to stop applying pressure against coup leaders in Honduras, who'd ousted a leftist President, **when conservative Republicans in Congress objected.** **Embargo supporters, including Cuban-American Senator** Robert **Menendez** of New Jersey, a Democrat, **are already blasting Obama's plans to relax Cuba travel**. "**This is not the time to ease the pressure** on the Castro regime," **Menendez said** this month, insisting it will only give the brothers "a much needed infusion of dollars that will only extend their reign of oppression." **As a result, says** one **congressional aide** who asked not to be identified, **when it comes time for the White House to give** the bill more **full**-throated **support,** "there's a fear **they may just decide that the fight's not worth it."** But Democratic Congressman Howard Berman of California, a co-sponsor of the bill, says tearing down the travel ban is about more than Cuban rights — it's also about the constitutional rights of U.S. citizens to travel freely abroad. "Letting U.S. citizens travel to Cuba is not a gift to the Castros — it is in the interest of our own citizens," Berman said after the House committee vote this summer. "It's time to trust our own people and restore their right to travel." It's the sort of argument **Obama** usually agrees with. But now he **may need to show how strongly he concurs when Congress returns** next month.

**General Link/A2: Increasing Cuban American Support**

**Opposition stronger, controls discussion and spin – growing Cuban American supporters lack political influence**

**Stieglitz, 11**

Matthew, Law Clerk at Vladeck, Waldman, Elias & Engelhard, P.C, Judicial Intern at United States District Court, Masters @ Cornell University, http://www.thepresidency.org/storage/Fellows2011/Stieglitz-\_Final\_Paper.pdf

The **research findings indicate** several **critical areas of importance** **regarding the normalization of relations with Cuba**: presidential action towards the island, constraining language within the 1996 Cuban Liberty and Solidarity Act, and **a stranglehold on Cuba discussions by conservative elements of the Cuban-American electorate. Of great importance** **is the fact that pro-normalization members of the Cuban-American community cannot compete with the community’s conservative members**. As **this** project **clearly illustrates**, a need for constructive **engagement with Cuba** exists. Arguably, this **can only be achieved after a change in philosophy from the Cuban-American lobby.**

**Plan drains capital despite changing politics – multiple reasons**

**Daily Beast, ‘8**

Daily Beast is an American news reporting and opinion website founded and published by Tina Brown, former editor of Vanity Fair and The New Yorker as well as the short-lived Talk Magazine. The Daily Beast was launched on 6 October 2008, and is owned by IAC. Edward Felsenthal, a former Wall Street Journal editor, is the site's executive editor, and Stephen Colvin is its president, 11/28, <http://www.thedailybeast.com/newsweek/2008/11/28/for-america-s-new-kennedy-a-d-tente-with-the-castros.html>

A rapprochement would also reflect a big change in U.S. domestic politics. **The deeply anti-Castro Cuban-American lobby has held sway over official Cuba policy for decades, and has acted as an important voting bloc** in the swing state of Florida. **But Cubans are now a minority among the state's Hispanics, and polls show that younger Cubans are far less rigid** about the U.S.'s Cuba policy than their parents and grandparents are. In November, Obama lost the Cuban-American vote, but he fared just fine with younger Cuban voters, and won the Hispanic vote and Florida overall. **So will the Cuban-Americans' dwindling power allow Obama to push Congress** to lift the trade embargo against Havana? **Unlikely, says** Daniel **Erikson, a Cuba expert at** the **Inter-American Dialogue**. He notes that **Congress's six Cuban-Americans wield considerable clout, and** that **25 percent of U.S. lawmakers took money from the Florida Cubans—60 percent of which went to Democrats. Obama has also vowed to keep the embargo as a bargaining chip to press Cuba for greater civil liberties. An even bigger obstacle**, says former senior U.S. diplomat Donna Hrinak**, is that "Obama has so many fires to put out, Cuba is not going to be anywhere near the top of the agenda**." But the fact that a Latin American state is on Washington's radar is already an improvement.

**Even if Cuban-american opinion has changed –Supporters lack political influence of plans opponents**

**LeoGrande, 12**

William M. LeoGrande School of Public Affairs American University, Professor of Government and a specialist in Latin American politics and U.S. foreign policy toward Latin America, Professor LeoGrande has been a frequent adviser to government and private sector agencies, 12/18/12, http://www.american.edu/clals/upload/LeoGrande-Fresh-Start.pdf

These **changes in Cuban-American opinion were clearly linked to demographic changes** in the community. Exiles who arrived in the United States in the 1960s and 1970s came as political refugees, motivated principally by their opposition to the socialist course of the revolution. Those who arrived in the Mariel exodus in 1980 and afterwards were more likely to have left for economic reasons. Recent arrivals, especially those who arrived in the post-cold war era, were far more likely to have maintained ties with family on the island. A 2007 poll of Cuban-Americans in south Florida found that 58.3% were sending remittances to Cuba, but fewer than half of those who arrived before 1985 were sending money, whereas three quarters of more recent arrivals were. **The differences in age and experience** among different waves of 12 migrants **produced sharply different opinions about relations with the island, with more recent arrivals being far more likely to favor policies that reduce bilateral tensions** and barriers to family linkages, especially the ability to travel and send remittances (Table 3). **Although** these **attitudinal differences have been clear for some time, they have not manifested themselves in Cuban-American voting behavior, principally because a far higher proportion of the early arrivals have obtained U.S. citizenship** (Table 4), **and thus still comprise a larger share of the Cuban-American electorate than more recent arrivals** (although by 2010, Cuban-Americans born in the United States were a larger voting bloc, comprising almost half the Cuban-American electorate) (Tables 5 and 6). **In addition, earlier arrivals are far more likely to be registered to vote** than more recent arrivals. **Registration rates for those who arrived before 1985 are over 90%,** whereas for post-cold war arrivals who are citizens, the rate is only 60%.13 But, of course, the early wave of exiles is becoming a smaller and smaller proportion of the community as new immigrants arrive every year and as natural mortality takes its toll on the aging exiles. And with the passage of time, more and more of the post-1980 immigrants obtain citizenship and begin to vote.

**Opposition strength outweighs despite increasing Cuban American support – Obama push is normal means**

**Stieglitz, 11**

Matthew, Law Clerk at Vladeck, Waldman, Elias & Engelhard, P.C, Judicial Intern at United States District Court, Masters @ Cornell University, http://www.thepresidency.org/storage/Fellows2011/Stieglitz-\_Final\_Paper.pdf

**Constructive Engagement**: The Need for a Progressive Cuban Lobby in Obama’s Washington **For years, the Cuban-American lobby has shaped American foreign policy towards Cuba.** **Dominating politics** in Miami for nearly three decades, **Cuban-American leaders have helped to perpetuate the Cuban embargo by staunchly advocating against normalized relations with Cuba**. As the Castro government faces its first serious ideological shift in years, **the hardline Cuban-American lobby continues to advocate for economic sanctions** against the island. **The challenge for** the **Obam**a Administration **is to create a Cuba policy that rises above the pressures of the well organized and well-funded Cuban-American lobby and draws**, instead, **on** those **sectors of the Cuban-American community who increasingly advocate for normalization**. The purpose of this research project is to analyze the US-Cuba trade embargo from the perspective of the American presidency, **with an emphasis on** the need for **constructive engagement** with Cuba. I provide an historical analysis of how **presidential action has influenced policy towards Cuba since 1959** with the hopes of offering the current president recommendations for policy initiatives that might improve US-Cuba relations. The project is an opportunity to explore the dynamics of the **staunchly conservative Cuban-American lobby**, which **has had a significant impact on US policy towards Cuba**, as well as the **more liberal voices in the community** that **seek to challenge their control** of this arena.

**General Link – Flip Flop**

**Doing Plan prior to release of Gross is a glaring and high profile flip flop**

**LeoGrande, 12**

William M. LeoGrande School of Public Affairs American University, Professor of Government and a specialist in Latin American politics and U.S. foreign policy toward Latin America, Professor LeoGrande has been a frequent adviser to government and private sector agencies, 12/18/12, http://www.american.edu/clals/upload/LeoGrande-Fresh-Start.pdf

**Even if the president decided that** improving relations with **Latin America demanded a new U.S. initiative on Cuba, there remains the problem of** Alan **Gross.** The Obama administration has declared that no progress can be made on state-to-state relations so long as Gross remains imprisoned, and has refused to discuss deeper cooperation even on issues of mutual interest such as counter-narcotics cooperation and immigration. **It would be a stark– and unlikely– reversal of policy for the White House to launch any major new initiative on Cuba until Gross is released.**

**A2: Aff small = no link**

*(1st card is Also 1st card in Anti Castro lobby links)*

**Drains capital – anti castro Cuba lobby is the powerbroker and controls the debate on EVERYTHING US Cuba related**

**Stieglitz, 11**

Matthew, Law Clerk at Vladeck, Waldman, Elias & Engelhard, P.C, Judicial Intern at United States District Court, Masters @ Cornell University, http://www.thepresidency.org/storage/Fellows2011/Stieglitz-\_Final\_Paper.pdf

This collaboration represented positive dialogue with Cuba, yet it did nothing to improve relations with Cuba. Subsequent to the Balsero crisis, the US **Congress acted to enforce stricter standards towards the island** in a landmark legislation that would effectively relegate the presidency to the backburner in relation to Cuba**. Driven** in part **by** CANF and the **lobbying efforts of the exile community**, the Cuban Liberty & Solidarity Act was passed in 1996 (also known as the Helms-Burton Act) further complicating relations with Cuba (Bardach, 2002). Essentially, the **legislation cedes greater authority to the US Congress** in ending the trade embargo, **making a** potential **pro-embargo majority in Congress the powerbrokers on everything US-Cuba related.** Simply stated, the Cuban Liberty & Democratic Solidarity Act disempowers the presidency in relation to Cuba. While the legislation calls for a variety of different elements, it has two **key components** in relation to the presidency: the embargo **can only be repealed by Congressional vote,** and it cannot be repealed until a democratic government is elected in Cuba that includes neither Fidel nor Raul Castro. This clearly hinders normalization because it effectively mitigates any transition efforts or progressive policies that the Castro brothers sponsor. Unless the legislation is repealed or amended, any progressive efforts or dialogue from the Cuban government will be irrelevant so long as the Castro brothers continue to lead the government. It also **constrains t**he US presidency, as President **Obama**—or any future president— cannot simply end the embargo with Cuba. Instead, **presidents must defer to the US Congress, which will make progressive policy with Cuba difficult.** **This** again **exemplifies the strength and importance of the Cuban-American lobby in policy discussions with Cuba.** **Not only did their efforts result in Congressional legislation that effectively ceded control of US relations with Cuba** to Congress, **but they also imposed the agenda of the electorate on American foreign policy. Subsequent to this legislation passing, the Cuban-American lobby would again work to have its voice heard** when a young boy, Elian González, was found floating in American waters, one of three survivors of an ill-fated voyage that claimed the lives of eleven people, including his mother. Under the Wet Foot, Dry Foot policy, Elian González could not be granted asylum in the United States because he was found in water. While his family in the US was more than willing to take the boy in, his status as a minor complicated matters with his father remaining in Cuba. **This placed the** Clinton **Administration in the middle of a highly contested debate that the Cuban-American electorate immediately moved to shape** (Bardach, 2002). The González case called into questions components of family law, immigration law, refugee policy, and politics, and presented the Cuban-American electorate its greatest opportunity to embarrass the Castro government. For President Clinton, it presented a crisis that necessitated caution, and would ultimately entail a moral debate that stirred immense media coverage of the Cuba dilemma itself. González's mother drowned in late 1999 while traveling with her son to the United States, and while the INS originally placed him with paternal family in Miami, his father objected to González remaining in the United States (Bardach, 2002). What ensued was a media nightmare, with national media outlets descending on Miami to interview the boy. Local politicians became involved, with the case eventually being deliberated in court where the family’s asylum petition was dismissed and González was ordered to return to his father. President Clinton almost exclusively deferred to Attorney General Janet Reno during the proceedings, who ultimately ordered the return of González to his father prior to the court decision. González’s return to Cuba coincided with the beginning of yet another decade in which the Cuban trade embargo would continue, and to date is the last controversial event of US-Cuba policy during the Castro regime (Bardach, 2002). Reflecting upon the Castro reign during the 20th century, **two themes emerge: the prominence of the Cuban-American community, and the actions of US presidents towards Cuba. The clout of the Cuban-American lobby cannot be understated, as the 2000** presidential **election showed** us. President George W. **Bush secured** his **victory** as president **in no small part due to the Cuban-American vote, which he and** Al **Gore campaign vigorously for**. **As such, the Gore and Bush campaigns remained relatively silent** on the Elian González case, leaving the matter to the courts **so as not to risk any backlash from the Cuban-American community**. After his victory, President Bush tightened restrictions on Cuba much like his Republican predecessors. He further restricted travel to the island for CubanAmericans, reduced the amount of remittances that could be sent to the island, placed Cuba on terror-watch lists after 9/11, and maintained that Cuba was a strategic threat to national security (Erlich, 2009). Further, cultural and academic exchanges were suspended, and many Cuban and American artists found themselves unable to attain visas to travel between Cuba and the United States to share the rich culture of both nations. By the time President Bush left office, the only Americans legally allowed to enter Cuba were journalists, family members (who could only go once every three years), and those visiting the island for religious reasons.

**Cuba is the 4 letter word of politics – obama’s avoiding it to conserve PC but plan can’t avoid the larger debate - outweighs turns despite growing support – also a flip flop**

**Clemons, Davidow and Rothkopf, ‘9**

Steve Clemons, Steve Clemons is Washington editor at large for The Atlantic and editor of Atlantic Live. He writes frequently about politics and foreign affairs.Clemons is a senior fellow and the founder of the American Strategy Program at the New America Foundation, a centrist think tank in Washington, D.C., where he previously served as executive vice president. He writes and speaks frequently about the D.C. political scene, foreign policy, and national security issues, as well as domestic and global economic-policy challenges, Jeffrey Davidow, White House Adviser for the Summit of the Americas and former US Ambassador to Mexico, David J. Rothkopf, President and CEO, Garten Rothkopf and visiting fellow at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Council of Foreign Relations, 4/9/9, http://www.thewashingtonnote.com/changing\_the\_cu\_1/

In response to a question I posed to Sweig’s panel, Obama administration Summit of the Americas point man Jeffrey Davidow fell back on droopy anachronisms while Foreign Policy magazine blogger and best-selling writer and geostrategic interpreter David Rothkopf hit the ball out of the park with his statement: “US-Cuba policy is the Edsel of American foreign policy.” The full line-up on Sweig’s panel included Jeffrey **Davidow, White House Adviser** for the Summit of the Americas and former US Ambassador to Mexico; Luis Alberto Moreno, President of the Inter-American Development Bank; and David J. Rothkopf, President and CEO, Garten Rothkopf and visiting fellow at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. The Summit of the Americas, which President Obama is attending, will convene in Trinidad & Tobago from April 17-19. After Davidow **successfully avoided mentioning the word “Cuba” in** his primary **remarks on the Obama** administration’s **game plan** for the Summit of the Americas, the former US Ambassador to Mexico finally offered in his penultimate exhale an acknowledgement that “Cuba might come up” in the meeting. And then he finished stating that other “flamboyant personalities may ‘flambay’” — a clear nod to Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez. When I had a chance to pose a question, I pressed Davidow pretty hard on what **he tried to avoid**. The exchange between Ambassador Davidow, David Rothkopf, and myself follows below. What is interesting and disconcerting is that Barack **Obama’s point guy** on this upcoming Summit **gave the** unreconstructed, **neoconservative-friendly**, ideologically vapid, ‘**unchastened by five decades of embargo failure’ answer** to my question **on Cuba.** Has Obama read the brief that his people are preparing for him on Cuba? Davidow embraced one of the worst single editorials I have read in years in the Washington Post titled “Coddling Cuba.” And Rothkopf did his part to say that on US-Cuba policy, the American position has no clothes — and has become completely illegitimate in the eyes of the world and undermines America’s own, parochial national interests. Here is the exchange in full between Sweig, Davidow, Rothkopf, and myself: Council on Foreign Relations – Washington, DC April 9, 2009 Perspectives on the Fifth Summit of the Americas: Cooperation on Development, Energy, and the Environment Speakers: Jeffrey Davidow, White House Adviser for the Summit of the Americas Luis Alberto Moreno, President, Inter-American Development Bank David J. Rothkopf, President and CEO, Garten Rothkopf Presider: Julia E. Sweig, Nelson and David Rockefeller Senior Fellow for Latin America Studies and Director for Latin America Studies, Council on Foreign Relations Partial Transcript of Q&A Exchange STEVE CLEMONS, Director, American Strategy Program, New America Foundation and Publisher, The Washington Note I would like to just start with what David Rothkopf said about the Cuban embargo, “the beginning of the end” and ask Ambassador Davidow if you would agree with David’s perspective on that, or perhaps his assertion. It’s very odd right now **when one looks at** Senator Richard **Lugar and his statements** on Cuba **that seem to be running politically left of the President**. Brent **Scowcroft has said recently that Cuba makes no sense at all as a foreign policy problem**. Russia’s lack of patronage of Cuba has shown that we can’t starve Cuba. So, part of the question is if Barack Obama is the change agent he said, is Cuba more than Cuba? Is it a place where the **steps you take there are so symbolic** that they can have echo effects geostrategically on other parts of the world? Or are we leaving this in the same arena where Senator Martinez and others would like to have it which is we are going to create opportunities for a class of ethnic Americans but not look at the broader geostrategic equation? JULIA SWEIG, Nelson and David Rockefeller Senior Fellow for Latin America Studies and Director for Latin America Studies, Council on Foreign Relations Ambassador Davidow? **It’s the “four letter word”** – not Peru – that you are asked to address now. AMBASSADOR JEFFREY DAVIDOW, White House Adviser for the Summit of the Americas I will try to answer that question. . . JULIA SWEIG, Nelson and David Rockefeller Senior Fellow for Latin America Studies and Director for Latin America Studies, Council on Foreign Relations And other panelists can chime in . . . AMBASSADOR JEFFREY DAVIDOW Yes, why don’t they! Look **it’s obviously a highly contentious issue**. From my perspective, a few points to make. From my perspective, I think **it would be unfortunate to lose** the **opportunity for this hemisphere**, at the beginning of **the Obama administration, to** set down some guidelines and **make some progress** jointly **by getting distracted by the Cuban issue. Cuba is not an issue for discussion** at the Summit if one reads the Summit declaration and the documents on all the past year of negotiation. However, having said that, and given what we are reading in the press, it is probable that it will come up in some way. The one point that I would respond to in Steve’s question specifically is, **“Is Cuba something larger than itself?” and the answer is ‘yes, it is’.** And I think that whatever the reasons have been in the 1960s for initiation of elements of our Cuban policy, the fact is in today’s Hemisphere, Cuba is the odd man out. Keep in mind that this meeting in Trinidad is a meeting of 34 democratic states. If we had been talking about a meeting of the hemisphere as little as twenty years ago, it would have been cast in a different light. There has been a remarkable historical transformation in this hemisphere, and a laudable one, toward democratically elected governments. We may have difficulty with some of the governments that have been democratically elected, of course, but this Summit is a reunion of countries and presidents, every one of which has been elected by their populations. There is not one government represented at this Summit whose population would willingly accept the kind of restrictions on their civil, political and human rights that are commonplace in Cuba – and that remain commonplace. So, I think as we talk about Cuba and talk about how we as a government deal with it and so forth, let’s keep in mind that it is something larger than itself, it is in a way a memory of that which existed in the past and a caution of what may exist in the future unless we are totally committed to the question of democracy, human rights and representation of people. And lest you think, and I’m sure some of you do, that I am some sort of ideologue on this, take a look at the lead editorial in today’s Washington Post. Maybe you think they are a bunch of ideologues as well, but I think they say it much better than I do. So, we have been struggling with Cuba as a nation for close to half a century and there is a real focus on what we should be doing, but to answer the question, it is an important place beyond a small island 90 miles off our shore DAVID J. ROTHKOPF, President and CEO, Garten Rothkopf If I may make a couple of brief comments on this- and I am unconstrained by affiliation with the United States government right now – so perhaps they will be in a slightly different direction. The editorial in today’s Washington Post was absurd. The position of the Florida contingent on this is Paleolithic. The policy is indefensible on any grounds, The reality is that Cuba may be special, but you **have to ask yourself why it’s** therefore **easier to travel to** or **do business with** the **Stalinist, nuclear weapon-toting North Koreans**, or whether it’s more comfortable for us to be totally economically integrated with the Saudi royal family and their depredations, or if we are concerned about human rights, why are we so integrated with and why are we the sole supporter of a government in Afghanistan that has just made rape in marriage legal and denies women the right to go outside without the approval of their husbands? So this notion that some how democracy alone is the only criteria that we should use in defining the nature of relationship doesn’t stand up to any scrutiny whatsoever, and the reality is that only one country that has successfully been isolated by this fifty year embargo, and that is the United States of America. Our [US-Cuba] policy dates back to the Edsel. It is the Edsel of American foreign policy. [END] David Rothkopf is absolutely right. Barack **Obama has given few indications** thus far **that he is willing to move** a five decade failed relationship **forward** in a meaningful sense — with the single exception that he may ironically codify “relaxation” for a class of ethnic Americans in a way that crudely discriminates against all other Americans. We did not open Vietnam by relaxing travel and remittances for Vietnamese-Americans. And Obama’s team — for all of the ballyhoo about democracy promotion — is promoting a policy of the United States government that restricts the American right of free travel anywhere. I thought that we lived in a real democracy — and that it was supposed to be Communist governments — not democracies — that restricted the travel rights of their citizens. President Obama is a busy man, but he better take a look at the brief that his team is preparing for him — otherwise he’ll learn too late that he’s driving “an Edsel” to the Summit of the Americas.

**Even small change in Cuba policy requires massive PC – Obama pushes plan and gets blame regardless**

**Aho, 13**

Matthew Aho, Inter-American Dialogue's Latin America Advisor, Cuba Study Group, 1/23, <http://www.cubastudygroup.org/index.cfm/our-opinions?ContentRecord_id=c20ad778-24cd-46df-9fb2-3ebc664ed58d&ContentType_id=15d70174-0c41-47c6-9bd5-cc875718b6c3&Group_id=4c543850-0014-4d3c-8f87-0cbbda2e1dc7>

What Does Obama's Second Term Hold for U.S.-Cuba Relations? John Kerry is expected to be confirmed soon as U.S. secretary of state. During his tenure in the Senate, Kerry has criticized U.S. programs aimed at fostering democracy in Cuba and proposed opening up U.S. travel to the island. Will having Kerry as secretary of state affect U.S. relations with Cuba? Will President Barack Obama's first-term moves to ease some travel and remittance restrictions for Cuban-Americans lead to additional relaxed restrictions in his second term? To what extent would looser restrictions toward Cuba present business opportunities for U.S. firms? Which industries could benefit? **While** John **Kerry's views on U.S.–Cuba relations have favored engagement** over isolation, **ultimate authority rests with a White House that has proceeded cautiously on Cuba during** President **Obama**'s first term. Aside from easing some travel restrictions, there have been only two emergent themes on Cuba policy: support for private-sector efforts to increase the flow of information to the Cuban people; and support for private economic activity on the island. **Cuba policy changes still require expenditures of political capital disproportionate to** the island's **strategic and economic importance. Barring game-changing developments**—such as release of USAID subcontractor Alan Gross—executive action during Obama's second term will likely focus on furthering goals laid out during his first. Here, however, John Kerry's leadership could prove vital and create new opportunities for U.S. business.

**Drains PC necessary for top Obama priorities – even minor concessions link unless they are expressly conditional**

**Stabroek News, ‘8**

11/14, http://www.stabroeknews.com/2008/opinion/editorial/11/14/mr-obama-and-cuba/

A repeal of the embargo would also present serious challenges to the Cuban Communist Party and its control of the country. For decades, the Cuban government has been able to maintain a siege mentality and rally the country against the spectre of the common enemy, the USA. If the embargo were to be eased, more government-to-government and people-to-people contact would help **to revive trade and investment** links and favour the free flow of ideas. Change would be natural and inevitable. In this respect, there could be at least two major outcomes: either the power of the state would be dramatically undermined or Raúl Castro would be encouraged to continue with his thus far modest economic and social reforms. In both cases, the human rights situation of the Cuban people should be improved, even as they should benefit economically. Ultimately, sooner or later, democratic change should come to Cuba. However, Mr **Obama**, even as he prepares to take office, **might not** yet **consider Cuba a top priority, preferring to spend his political capital on more pressing issues. But he could still progressively relax the embargo in exchange for concessions by the Cuban government**, until he is ready to lift it completely. And **it would be a bold move** indeed **if and when he decides to persuade** the Democrat-controlled **Congress to remove the ban on** all Americans desirous of visiting and **doing business** in Cuba, and eliminate the embargo altogether.

**A2: Avoids Congress**

**overwhelming congressional backlash and executive bureaucracy resistance require mass PC even if plan never goes through congress - zero sum with higher priorities on agenda**

**LeoGrande, 12**

William M. LeoGrande School of Public Affairs American University, Professor of Government and a specialist in Latin American politics and U.S. foreign policy toward Latin America, Professor LeoGrande has been a frequent adviser to government and private sector agencies, 12/18/12, http://www.american.edu/clals/upload/LeoGrande-Fresh-Start.pdf

**Can Obama Break the Stalemate? Many of the same forces that prevented Obama from a** taking truly **new approach to U.S.- Cuban relations** during his first term **will still be operative** during his second. **Seemingly more urgent issues will demand his time, pulling his attention away from Cuba. He will still face fierce congressional resistance to any Cuba initiative, some from within his own party. Without pressure from above, the foreign policy bureaucracy**, especially the Department of State, **will remain paralyzed by inertia and fear. And,** for the time being, Alan **Gross is still in prison**. **If Obama is going to** finally keep the promise of his 2008 campaign to **take a new direction** in relations **with Cuba, he will need to give the issue more sustained attention** than he did in his first term. The damage being done to U.S. relations with Latin America because of U.S. intransigence on Cuba justifies moving Cuba higher up on the president's foreign policy agenda**. Only sustained attention from the White House** and a willing secretary of state **will be able to drive a new policy through a reluctant bureaucracy**. **Obama will also need to be willing to marshal his forces on Capitol Hill to confront those who have developed a vested interest in sustaining the policy of the past**. Finally, **the president will need the courage to take the first step,** proposing a humanitarian initiative that leads to the release of Alan Gross, thereby opening the way to a wide range of state-to-state cooperative agreements.

**Ag Sale Regulations Links**

**Expanding Ag Sales drains PC - Our Lobby, campaign contributions, GOP, Dem Unity, Filibuster, Committee, Menendez and Reid links outweigh every possible turn**

**LeoGrande, 12**

William M. LeoGrande School of Public Affairs American University, Professor of Government and a specialist in Latin American politics and U.S. foreign policy toward Latin America, Professor LeoGrande has been a frequent adviser to government and private sector agencies, 12/18/12, http://www.american.edu/clals/upload/LeoGrande-Fresh-Start.pdf

The 113th Congress **Congress has held a central role in U.S. policy toward Cuba** ever since it codified the U.S. embargo into law in the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act of 1996 (Helms-Burton). **To move** beyond limited improvements in relations on issues of mutual interest or limited commercial activity– that is, to move **toward** the full normalization of diplomatic and **economic relations**– **the president would have to win congressional approval to change the law**. In 2000, the Congress passed the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000, which legalized the sale of food products to Cuba, albeit on a cash-only basis, but at the same time prohibited tourist travel by U.S. residents. For the next four years, the bipartisan Cuba Working Group in the House of Representatives worked to end all prohibitions on travel to Cuba. In 2001, Jeff Flake (R-Ariz.), the founder along with Bill Delahunt (D-Mass.) of the Cuba Working Group, introduced an amendment to the Treasury appropriation bill prohibiting enforcement of the travel ban. The House approved it in July by a wide margin (240-186), but it was dropped in conference committee by the Republican House leadership in response to Bush’s veto threat. For the next three years, this scenario was replayed annually. The House (and the 27 Senate in 2003 and 2004) voted to end enforcement of the travel ban, but congressional Republicans conspired with the White House to prevent it from becoming law by repeatedly dropping the provision from the final bill. “People are wrong to underestimate what it means to have President Bush on our side,” Lincoln Diaz-Balart (R-Fla) said with satisfaction. By 2005, 28 a sense of futility had eroded the Cuba Working Group. **Aided by campaign contributions to key members of the House from the** new **pro-embargo U.S.-Cuba Democracy PAC, Republicans were able to defeat amendments easing restrictions** on travel **to Cuba and block consideration of others in 2005 and 2006**.29 **With** President **Obama promising** a **new** policy of **engagement toward Cuba** and having lifted travel restrictions on Cuban Americans in 2009, **freedom-to-travel advocates launched a new congressional campaign to lift the travel ban. With large Democratic majorities** in both the House and Senate**, hopes ran high for success**. **Over 170 cosponsors quickly signed** on in the House. **A broad coalition of** some 130 **business groups and foreign policy NGOs formed behind the campaign, including** the U.S. **Chamber of Commerce,** American **Farm Bureau** Federation, National Farmers Union, American Society of Travel Agents, Amnesty International, the **A**merican **C**ivil **Li**berties **U**nion, **and** the U.S. Conference of **Catholic Bishops**. The travel web site Orbitz collected over 100,000 signatures on a petition to lift the travel ban. **As a measure of its commitment, the Chamber of Commerce warned legislators** that **their vote on Cuba would be “scored” as a key business vote** included in the Chamber’s annual “How They Voted” scorecard.30 **Public opinion, even among Cuban-Americans, favored** the freedom to travel. A 2008 poll in south Florida by Florida International University found that 67% favored “ending current travel restrictions for all Americans.” A national poll of Cuban-Americans the following year by Bendixen and Associates found the same result, and a 2010 poll by a faculty member at the University of Miami found support at 64%. The general public’s view was even more lopsided: 31 70% favored unrestricted travel to Cuba, and even 62% of Republicans agreed.32 **Opponents blasted the** freedom-to-travel **coalition as** venial for **putting dollars ahead of human rights. Senator** Robert **Menendez** (D-NJ), who **pledged to filibuster** the bill if it ever got to the Senate, **denounced businessmen who “only care about padding their profits by opening up a new market,” even though it meant “enriching the Castro regime.” Congresswoman Ros** 33 **Lehtinen attacked proponents** of free travel **for,** “**seek[ing] to reward the Cuban regime with** tourism **cash flows** as the dictatorship tightens its stranglehold on the Cuban people.”34 **The legislative vehicle for opening travel and facilitating agricultural sales** was House Resolution (H.R.) 4645, the “Travel Restriction Reform and Export Enhancement Act,” cosponsored by House Agricultural Committee Chair Collin Peterson (D-Minn) and Jerry Moran (R-Kan.). It **cleared the Ag**ricultural **Committee** on July 1, 2010, **by a narrow** 25-20 **margin,** and was referred to the **Foreign Affairs Committee**. **For weeks**, Committee **Chair** Howard Berman (D-Calif.) **tried to collect the votes needed to report the bill out** to the House floor. In September, **still** one or two **votes short**, with Congress drawing to a close for the election campaign, **he gave up. The bill died in committee. The principal obstacle** faced by supporters of the travel bill **was not** the **opposition of Republicans like Ros-Lehtinen** and the Diaz-Balart brothers, **but opposition from moderate and conservative Democrats. In the Senate, not only did Menendez promise to block any travel bill, Majority Leader** Harry **Reid** (D-Nev) **also opposed** unfettered travel, **and he controlled the flow of legislation to the Senate floor. In the House,** Debbie Wasserman **Schultz, a rising star of the party** from south Florida, **took it upon herself to organize opposition** to the travel bill **within the Democratic caucus**. Wasserman Schultz was in charge of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee's “Red to Blue” project in the 2008 election cycle, aimed at unseating Republican incumbents (though not in south Florida, where Wasserman Schultz refused to campaign against her three Republican friends– Ros-Lehtinen and the Diaz-Balarts). **Many** freshman **Democrats– especially** those **from** relatively **conservative districts**– **were in her debt. A vote on Cuba, which was not a salient or popular issue in their constituencies, was a small price to pay** to stay in Wasserman Schultz’s good graces. When supporters of the travel bill first rolled it out with 178 cosponsors, Wasserman **Schultz recruited 53 House Democrats to write a letter to** Speaker Nancy **Pelosi declaring their determination to vote against it– a formidable number that foreshadowed a nasty battle inside the Democratic caucus** if the bill went to the House floor, **and put final passage in doubt. In 2011,** President **Obama selected** Wasserman **Schultz to chair the** **Democratic National Committee**

**Removing regulatory barriers on farm exports requires massive PC – Obama pushes plan and gets blame regardless**

**Aho, 13**

Matthew Aho, Inter-American Dialogue's Latin America Advisor, Cuba Study Group, 1/23, <http://www.cubastudygroup.org/index.cfm/our-opinions?ContentRecord_id=c20ad778-24cd-46df-9fb2-3ebc664ed58d&ContentType_id=15d70174-0c41-47c6-9bd5-cc875718b6c3&Group_id=4c543850-0014-4d3c-8f87-0cbbda2e1dc7>

What Does Obama's Second Term Hold for U.S.-Cuba Relations? John Kerry is expected to be confirmed soon as U.S. secretary of state. During his tenure in the Senate, Kerry has criticized U.S. programs aimed at fostering democracy in Cuba and proposed opening up U.S. travel to the island. Will having Kerry as secretary of state affect U.S. relations with Cuba? Will President Barack Obama's first-term moves to ease some travel and remittance restrictions for Cuban-Americans lead to additional relaxed restrictions in his second term? To what extent would looser restrictions toward Cuba present business opportunities for U.S. firms? Which industries could benefit? **While** John **Kerry's views on U.S.–Cuba relations have favored engagement** over isolation, **ultimate authority rests with a White House that has proceeded cautiously on Cuba during** President **Obama**'s first term. Aside from easing some travel restrictions, there have been only two emergent themes on Cuba policy: support for private-sector efforts to increase the flow of information to the Cuban people; and support for private economic activity on the island. **Cuba policy changes still require expenditures of political capital disproportionate to the island's strategic and economic importance.** Barring game-changing developments—such as release of USAID subcontractor Alan Gross—executive action during Obama's second term will likely focus on furthering goals laid out during his first. Here, however, John Kerry's leadership could prove vital and create new opportunities for U.S. business. In 2009 **the White House directed** the Treasury and Commerce departments—in consultation with State—to authorize U.S. telecommunications firms to negotiate international roaming agreements with Cuba. This would allow U.S. travelers to use their cell phones on the island and presumably increase communications flows with Cuba. It would also generate some new revenue for U.S. firms. Three years later, there's still no agreement—partly because federal agencies haven't clearly communicated how they will handle industry proposals to establish one. This issue may seem insignificant, but in the context of U.S.–Cuba relations it would be an historic first. Kerry could sit down with industry to revisit this issue to help finally get an agreement signed. **Kerry could** also **encourage the president to make** other common-sense, **executive-branch changes** within the scope of current policy, **such as** allowing U.S. travelers to access basic financial services and purchase insurance products to ensure their safety and wellbeing while in Cuba; or **remove regulatory impediments to U.S. farm exports.**

**Six reasons plan Drains Obama capital despite changing cuban sentiment, business, and ag support**

* Committee opposition
* Powerful pro embargo lobby and campaign contributions
* Both house and senate oppose
* Filibuster swamps even majority support
* Empirics prove outweighs turns
* Obama push/PC drain is normal means – can’t overcome opposition without it

**Padgett, 10** (Tim, Latin America Bureau Chief @ Time Magazine last 14 years, 8/23, <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,2013820,00.html>)

Will the White House Fight to End the Cuba Travel Ban? After it looked a couple of months ago as if **a bill lifting** the **ban on** U.S. **travel** to Cuba had the momentum to pass Congress, it now appears **stalled** in the House of Representatives. **The bill, which** would also **make food sales to Cuba easier, cleared the** House **Agr**iculture Committee **but still needs** a **vote in two other committees** — Financial Services and Foreign Affairs — and **it may not even come up for** a full **vote** this year. So as reports surface that the Obama Administration plans on its own to expand legal travel opportunities to Cuba, the question is whether such a move will spur or spoil the House bill — whose passage would mark the biggest shift in U.S. Cuba policy since a trade embargo was issued against the communist island in 1962. President Obama, according to Administration and congressional sources, intends before the year is out to loosen restrictions on visits to Cuba by U.S. students, entertainers and other goodwill ambassadors. Backers of increased American engagement with Cuba applaud the proposal, which is part of the President's executive prerogative under the embargo. In reality, the action would simply be taking U.S. policy back to the Clinton Administration, before former President George W. Bush all but froze that kind of people-to-people contact with Cuba. But **it's less clear if Obama intends** his new regulations to be a signal of support for eliminating the entire travel ban — which only Congress can do — or an unspoken message that this is as far as he wants **to take the battle against the embargo's dogged supporters on Capitol Hill**. The bill's bipartisan backers, not surprisingly, see it as the former. House staffers say the White House Cuba regulations will be a shot in the arm for the broader travel legislation when Congress returns from its recess next month. Embargo foes agree. "This is the Administration essentially saying, 'We've done what we can, and now we want Congress to take the larger step,'" says Jake Colvin, vice president for global trade issues at the independent National Foreign Trade Council in Washington, D.C. "**This bill** still **has a lot of hurdles**, but this implicit White House support gives it momentum again." Echoing the optimism is Patrick Kilbride, senior director for the Americas at the U.S. **Chamber of Commerce**. The organization represents a sizable bloc of **farmers and businesspeople**, many of them Republican-aligned, who **want the** Cuba **embargo scrapped** so they can reap the $1 billion in annual sales to the island that a recent Texas A&M University study says they're losing out on. "We think these new [travel] steps are a very positive signal that the [Administration] would like to move forward" to lift the full travel ban, says Kilbride. He also confirms that the chamber is considering scoring the votes of Representatives and Senators if and when the bill finally hits their floors. **The House bill seems slowed at this point by more serious opposition from the chamber's pro-embargo forces and especially the pro-embargo lobby, led by the US-Cuba Democracy PAC, a major contributor to congressional campaigns. The Senate version,** which deals only with the travel ban, **has yet to get a Foreign Relations Committee vote and most likely faces a filibuster from pro-embargo Senators if it can ever get to the full chamber**. (See pictures of Fidel Castro's years in power.) But another reason to be confident, says Colvin, is that "this is the best diplomatic environment we've seen in a long time" for dismantling the embargo. That's because last month, Cuban President Raúl Castro, after a dissident hunger striker died earlier this year, released 52 political prisoners who were locked up in 2003 by his elder brother, then President Fidel Castro (who ceded power to Raúl in 2006 due to ill health). Obama last year had left the ball in Havana's court when he reversed his predecessor's policy and let Cuban Americans travel and send remittances more freely to Cuba. Raúl's prisoner release, say diplomats, **now makes the next move Obama's**, and many see his new travel regulations as part of that. But it's doubtful the Castros will feel international pressure to reciprocate, with further democratic or economic openings in Cuba, unless the travel ban that's been in place since 1963 is eradicated. **Proponents** of doing just that **insist there's more consensus than ever in the U.S. to ditch the Cuba embargo** and its travel ban, which, after almost 50 years, have utterly failed to dislodge the Castro regime. Opening Cuba to Americans, they believe, will do more to stimulate democratization there than isolating it has. **Even a majority of Cuban Americans now agree. Still, for all the good vibes the bill's backers feel from the White House** right now, some note warily that **Obama has been loath to spend political capital in Cuba, or the rest of Latin America for that matter**. Critics, for example, point to his decision last year to stop applying pressure against coup leaders in Honduras, who'd ousted a leftist President, **when conservative Republicans in Congress objected.** **Embargo supporters, including Cuban-American Senator** Robert **Menendez** of New Jersey, a Democrat, **are already blasting Obama's plans to relax Cuba travel**. "**This is not the time to ease the pressure** on the Castro regime," **Menendez said** this month, insisting it will only give the brothers "a much needed infusion of dollars that will only extend their reign of oppression." **As a result, says** one **congressional aide** who asked not to be identified, **when it comes time for the White House to give** the bill more **full**-throated **support,** "there's a fear **they may just decide that the fight's not worth it."** But Democratic Congressman Howard Berman of California, a co-sponsor of the bill, says tearing down the travel ban is about more than Cuban rights — it's also about the constitutional rights of U.S. citizens to travel freely abroad. "Letting U.S. citizens travel to Cuba is not a gift to the Castros — it is in the interest of our own citizens," Berman said after the House committee vote this summer. "It's time to trust our own people and restore their right to travel." It's the sort of argument **Obama** usually agrees with. But now he **may need to show how strongly he concurs when Congress returns** next month.

**Lifting food purchase restrictions costs PC – lobby, campaign contribution and dem unity links**

**LeoGrande, 12**

William M. LeoGrande School of Public Affairs American University, Professor of Government and a specialist in Latin American politics and U.S. foreign policy toward Latin America, Professor LeoGrande has been a frequent adviser to government and private sector agencies, 12/18/12, http://www.american.edu/clals/upload/LeoGrande-Fresh-Start.pdf

**Money played a role** as well. **The U.S. Cuba Democracy PAC handed out** $2.2 million in **campaign contributions** up through the 2010 election cycle. **Conservatives associated with the group gave another $9 million individually** or through Lincoln Diaz-Balart’s Democracy Believers PAC. Beginning with the 2006 election cycle, these **donors directed their money increasingly to Democratic candidates**– from just 29% in 2004 to 43% in 2006, 59% in 2008, and 76% in 2010 (despite the Republicans’ success in the 2010 mid-terms). **The impact was immediately apparent. In 2007, the House voted down** (245-182), **a proposal** by Charlie Rangel (D-NY) **to relax restrictions on Cuban purchases of food** from the United States. **Of the 66 Democrats voting against, 52 had received money from the U.S. Cuba Democracy PAC**. The PAC focused special attention on freshmen members, often contributing to their campaigns as challengers. Of the 22 Democratic freshman it funded, 17 voted against Rangel. **PAC money** 37 also **changed votes; seventeen House members who received contributions** from the PAC **switched from being consistent supporters of measures to relax sanctions on Cuba, to opposing them. Of the 53 Democrats who signe**d Wasserman **Schultz’s letter to** Nancy **Pelosi opposing** travel **liberalization, 51 were recipients of the U.S.- Cuba Democracy PAC’s largesse**.38

**Embargo Link - Sugar Lobby**

**Powerful sugar lobby hates economic engagement with cuba**

**Knapp, 9**

Thomas L. Knapp, Senior News Analyst and Media Coordinator at the Center for c4ss.org, 11/2/9, http://c4ss.org/content/1369

Case in point: The US trade embargo on Cuba. For going on 50 years now, the rights and welfare of both Cubans and Americans have taken second place to the alleged desire of the US government to topple Fidel Castro’s communist regime. I say “alleged,” because the real purpose of the embargo from the US standpoint certainly isn’t to “protect” the US from Cuba, which hasn’t represented a significant military threat since the Soviet Union blinked first in the “missile crisis” of the early 1960s. Nor is it to bring down Castro, whose regime has benefited immensely from it. Rather**, its real purpose is to pump anti-Castro Cuban-Americans** in Florida — **held in sway by an “anti-Castro dissident industry”** whose principals are far more interested in **amassing wealth and influence in the US** than in actually liberating Cuba — **and subsidy-seeking sugar producers (who don’t want to have to compete with Cuban sugar imports) for campaign money and November votes**. And while Castro’s regime and that of his successor, his brother Raul, have always talked a good anti-embargo game, they’re Johnny on the spot and ready to escalate tensions with the US any time it looks like the matter is up for serious reconsideration. From their standpoint, El Bloqueo may be the single best guarantee of their continued hold on power. It gives them a ready-made foreign enemy — an enemy to blame for the failure of Castro’s socialist revolution and an enemy to wave at its subjects as a military threat against which those subjects must stand united. What would be the result of an end to the embargo — assuming, as it is never safe to do, that both governments were actually willing to drop it into the wastebasket of history? **On the economic side**, consumers and non-rent-seeking producers in both countries would benefit. **Sugar in particular would get cheaper in the US as American producers were forced to compete** in an open market **instead of being “protected” from Cuban cane**. Goods of all types would get cheaper in Cuba as American imports which only have to be shipped across 90 miles of ocean arrive to compete with their European equivalents. Producers in both countries would have new markets opened to them, and capital from both countries would have new, competitive places to flow to. **On the political side**, citizens of both countries would regain at least some freedoms their governments have denied them. Freedom to travel. Freedom to trade. Freedom to engage with each other. Only the two regimes would lose, and the things they’d lose — opportunities to indulge in control and corruption — are things they were never rightfully entitled to in the first place. **The beneficiaries** of the embargo **are the politicians** of both governments **and their rent-seeking paymasters**. The rest of us take it right on the chin. To understand any government policy, ask the question the Romans asked when looking into lesser criminal matters: “cui bono” (“who benefits”). The actions of the ruling class are seldom undertaken for the benefit of the ruled.

**Telecomm link**

**New support for private Telecomm agreements requires massive PC – Obama pushes plan and gets blame regardless**

**Aho, 13**

Matthew Aho, Inter-American Dialogue's Latin America Advisor, Cuba Study Group, 1/23, <http://www.cubastudygroup.org/index.cfm/our-opinions?ContentRecord_id=c20ad778-24cd-46df-9fb2-3ebc664ed58d&ContentType_id=15d70174-0c41-47c6-9bd5-cc875718b6c3&Group_id=4c543850-0014-4d3c-8f87-0cbbda2e1dc7>

What Does Obama's Second Term Hold for U.S.-Cuba Relations? John Kerry is expected to be confirmed soon as U.S. secretary of state. During his tenure in the Senate, Kerry has criticized U.S. programs aimed at fostering democracy in Cuba and proposed opening up U.S. travel to the island. Will having Kerry as secretary of state affect U.S. relations with Cuba? Will President Barack Obama's first-term moves to ease some travel and remittance restrictions for Cuban-Americans lead to additional relaxed restrictions in his second term? To what extent would looser restrictions toward Cuba present business opportunities for U.S. firms? Which industries could benefit? **While** John **Kerry's views on U.S.–Cuba relations have favored engagement** over isolation, **ultimate authority rests with a White House that has proceeded cautiously on Cuba during** President **Obama**'s first term. Aside from easing some travel restrictions, there have been only two emergent themes on Cuba policy: support for private-sector efforts to increase the flow of information to the Cuban people; and support for private economic activity on the island. **Cuba policy changes still require expenditures of political capital disproportionate to the** island's **strategic and economic importance.** Barring game-changing developments—such as release of USAID subcontractor Alan Gross—executive action during Obama's second term will likely focus on furthering goals laid out during his first. Here, however, John Kerry's leadership could prove vital and create new opportunities for U.S. business. In 2009 **the White House directed** the Treasury and Commerce departments—in consultation with State—to authorize U.S. **telecommunications firms to negotiate** international **roaming agreements** with Cuba. This would allow U.S. travelers to use their cell phones on the island and presumably increase communications flows with Cuba. It would also generate some new revenue for U.S. firms. Three years later, **there's still no agreement—partly because federal agencies haven't clearly communicated how they will handle industry proposals to establish one**. **This issue** may seem insignificant, but **in** the **context of U.S.–Cuba relations** it **would be an historic first**. Kerry could sit down with industry to revisit this issue to help finally get an agreement signed. Kerry could also encourage the president to make other common-sense, executive-branch changes within the scope of current policy, such as allowing U.S. travelers to access basic financial services and purchase insurance products to ensure their safety and wellbeing while in Cuba; or remove regulatory impediments to U.S. farm exports.

**Travelers Financial Service/Insurance Access Lx**

**Allowing US travelers financial service and insurance access requires massive PC – Obama pushes plan and gets blame regardless**

**Aho, 13**

Matthew Aho, Inter-American Dialogue's Latin America Advisor, Cuba Study Group, 1/23, <http://www.cubastudygroup.org/index.cfm/our-opinions?ContentRecord_id=c20ad778-24cd-46df-9fb2-3ebc664ed58d&ContentType_id=15d70174-0c41-47c6-9bd5-cc875718b6c3&Group_id=4c543850-0014-4d3c-8f87-0cbbda2e1dc7>

What Does Obama's Second Term Hold for U.S.-Cuba Relations? John Kerry is expected to be confirmed soon as U.S. secretary of state. During his tenure in the Senate, Kerry has criticized U.S. programs aimed at fostering democracy in Cuba and proposed opening up U.S. travel to the island. Will having Kerry as secretary of state affect U.S. relations with Cuba? Will President Barack Obama's first-term moves to ease some travel and remittance restrictions for Cuban-Americans lead to additional relaxed restrictions in his second term? To what extent would looser restrictions toward Cuba present business opportunities for U.S. firms? Which industries could benefit? **While** John **Kerry's views on U.S.–Cuba relations have favored engagement** over isolation, **ultimate authority rests with a White House that has proceeded cautiously on Cuba during** President **Obama**'s first term. Aside from easing some travel restrictions, there have been only two emergent themes on Cuba policy: support for private-sector efforts to increase the flow of information to the Cuban people; and support for private economic activity on the island. **Cuba policy changes still require expenditures of political capital disproportionate to the** island's **strategic and economic importance.** Barring game-changing developments—such as release of USAID subcontractor Alan Gross—executive action during Obama's second term will likely focus on furthering goals laid out during his first. Here, however, John Kerry's leadership could prove vital and create new opportunities for U.S. business. In 2009 the White House directed the Treasury and Commerce departments—in consultation with State—to authorize U.S. telecommunications firms to negotiate international roaming agreements with Cuba. This would allow U.S. travelers to use their cell phones on the island and presumably increase communications flows with Cuba. It would also generate some new revenue for U.S. firms. Three years later, there's still no agreement—partly because federal agencies haven't clearly communicated how they will handle industry proposals to establish one. This issue may seem insignificant, but in the context of U.S.–Cuba relations it would be an historic first. Kerry could sit down with industry to revisit this issue to help finally get an agreement signed. **Kerry could** also **encourage the president to make** other common-sense, **executive-branch changes** within the scope of current policy, such as **allowing U.S. travelers to access basic financial services and** purchase **insurance** products **to ensure** **their safety and wellbeing while in Cuba**; or remove regulatory impediments to U.S. farm exports.

**QPQ CPs Avoid Politics**

**Only Genuine QPQ with Cuba avoids politics**

**Hakim et al, 12**

Peter Hakim, Andrés Rozental, Rubens Barbosa, Riordan Roett, Ruben Olmos

Inter-American Dialogue’s Latin America Advisor, Peter Hakim is president emeritus and senior fellow of the Inter-American Dialogue, a Washington-based think tank on Western Hemisphere affairs. He served as president of the Dialogue from 1993 to 2010, writes and speaks widely on hemispheric issues, and has testified more than a dozen times before Congress. His articles have appeared in Foreign Affairs, Foreign Policy, The New York Times, The Washington Post, Miami Herald, Los Angeles Times, and Financial Times, and in newspapers and journals in Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Mexico, Peru, and other Latin American nations. He is a regular guest on CNN, BBC, CBS, CNN en Español and other prominent news stations around the world. He wrote a monthly column for the Christian Science Monitor for nearly ten years, and now serves as a board member of Foreign Affairs Latinoamerica and editorial advisor to Americaeconomia, where he also publishes a regular column11/8/12 http://www.thedialogue.org/page.cfm?pageID=32&pubID=3135

What Will Obama's Second Term Mean **for Latin America**? Q: Barack Obama was re-elected president of the United States on Tuesday. What is his vision for foreign policy and how does Latin America fit into his plans? How will Latin American leaders and their citizens react to the election results? **What** role did Latinos in the United States play in **the election** and what does that **mean for U.S. policy changes on** issues such as immigration, drugs and **Cuba**? A: Peter Hakim, member of the Advisor board and president emeritus of the Inter-American Dialogue: "Any speculation about Obama's second term has to come mainly from his first-term performance. The campaign was about the candidates and their biographies—not about issues. **Nothing suggests Congress will be** more **productive. The House remains** virtually **unchanged. The Senate will be more divisive** still as most remaining moderate Republicans and Democrats resigned or lost their seats. We will know soon whether compromise is possible when the lame-duck Congress returns next week, and begins discussion of the fiscal cliff embroglio. The best guess is that Congress will find a way, not to resolve the problem, but to defer its consequences. The election results focused attention on immigration policy, which both Republicans and Democrats may be motivated to address. President Obama's declared intention to address immigration was surely reinforced by the huge Latino vote. Many of the Republicans who blocked previous immigration initiatives will resist again. But some recognize their party may become irrelevant unless they take seriously the Latino and black constituencies that accounted for more than 40 percent of Obama's total. U.S. immigration reform would be a welcome change in most of Latin America, particularly in Mexico, Central America and the Caribbean. **Obama may seek** to pursue **further openings to Cuba**—**but these will be limited unless the Cuban government shows a willingness to reciprocate with new human rights measures or political changes**. Drug policy is not high on the U.S. agenda, but the approval in Colorado and Washington of ballot initiatives to legalize marijuana use may spark wider discussion on drug issues. But Mitt Romney offered the most significant policy proposal for Latin America, when called for more intensive U.S. efforts to pursue multiplying economic opportunities in the region." A: Andrés Rozental, member of the Advisor board, president of Rozental & Asociados in Mexico City and senior fellow at the Brookings Institution: "President Obama's re-election is a welcome development for Latin Americans in general, and Mexicans in particular. Although many of Obama's campaign promises in 2008 relevant to the region remain unrealized, there is a modicum of hope that as a leader in his second term, **with more political capital to spend, he can** at least **make a stronger effort to tackle comprehensive immigration reform** and trade issues critical to Latin American prosperity. **Although I don't foresee any major change in** the **U**nited **S**tates' foreign **policy toward the region, especially as long as Afghanistan, Iran and the Middle East remain priorities for Washington**, that may not necessarily be a bad thing. We often complain when Washington pays too much attention to us, and equally when there's less overt interest in the region, but I believe that Obama has mostly shown a much more mature attitude toward Latin America over the last four years than has traditionally been the case. This will hopefully also be the case as his administration continues through 2016. Presumably, there will continue to be a strong focus on completing ongoing trade negotiations, especially the Trans-Pacific Partnership, to open new opportunities for economic growth and hopefully a re-visiting of NAFTA as a key option to make North America more competitive on the global scene. Latinos played a key role in re-electing Obama, just as they did in 2008, and the one message that Republicans have to take home at this stage is that the anti-immigrant, exclusionary policies voiced during the campaign by Mitt Romney, the Tea Party and other conservatives were a key factor in their ultimate defeat. Many of Obama's liberal views on minority rights and tolerance turned out to be much more popular among Americans as a whole than the opposing Republican positions on those same issues." A: Rubens Barbosa, former ambassador of Brazil to the United States: "In his second term, Obama will be more interested in looking for his legacy in history. The U.S. government will tend to be more proactive and try to increase its influence in the current hot spots: Pakistan, Syria, Iran and elsewhere in the Middle East. The relationship with China will continue to be high on the foreign policy agenda. Having in mind this scenario, **Latin America will continue to be off the radar of U.S. decision makers: the region will remain a low priority for Washington.** Despite this fact, the reaction of the Latin American leaders and citizens to Obama's re-election has been very positive. The role of Latinos in the election was important and in some places crucial. **In terms of policy changes on** issues such as immigration, drugs and **Cuba, Obama will continue to face strong opposition from the Republican Party** but I would not be surprised if new ideas could be advanced by the administration especially in relation to immigration and Cuba." A: Riordan Roett, director of the Latin American Studies program at the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies: "While the president's re-election is welcome in general terms**, it is difficult to imagine Latin America will receive greater attention** in the next four years. **Congress remains deeply divided**. The administration's foreign policy priorities will continue to focus on China, the Middle East and the ongoing fiscal challenges. Given the strong turnout by the Latino community, **one area that should receive priority is** continued **immigration reform**, but it is the third rail for the Republican majority in the House. In general, the democratic governments of the region will welcome the president's election without great expectation for major policy initiatives. The populist regimes will continue to denounce any democratically elected administration. The **deadlock over Cuba will continue unless there is a dramatic leadership shift** to a new generation. The **major policy initiative** that would be welcome in the region is on drug policy, but that issue **will remain taboo**."

**Drains PC necessary for top Obama priorities – only genuine conditioning avoids the link**

**Stabroek News, ‘8**

11/14, http://www.stabroeknews.com/2008/opinion/editorial/11/14/mr-obama-and-cuba/

A repeal of the embargo would also present serious challenges to the Cuban Communist Party and its control of the country. For decades, the Cuban government has been able to maintain a siege mentality and rally the country against the spectre of the common enemy, the USA. If the embargo were to be eased, more government-to-government and people-to-people contact would help **to revive trade and investment** links and favour the free flow of ideas. Change would be natural and inevitable. In this respect, there could be at least two major outcomes: either the power of the state would be dramatically undermined or Raúl Castro would be encouraged to continue with his thus far modest economic and social reforms. In both cases, the human rights situation of the Cuban people should be improved, even as they should benefit economically. Ultimately, sooner or later, democratic change should come to Cuba. However, Mr **Obama**, even as he prepares to take office, **might not** yet **consider Cuba a top priority, preferring to spend his political capital on more pressing issues. But he could still progressively relax the embargo in exchange for concessions by the Cuban government**, until he is ready to lift it completely. And it would be a bold move indeed if and when he decides to persuade the Democrat-controlled Congress to remove the ban on all Americans desirous of visiting and doing business in Cuba, and eliminate the embargo altogether.

**Plan sparks massive backlash and PC loss absent genuine deal on Gross’s release**

**Aho, 13**

Matthew Aho, Inter-American Dialogue's Latin America Advisor, Cuba Study Group, 1/23, <http://www.cubastudygroup.org/index.cfm/our-opinions?ContentRecord_id=c20ad778-24cd-46df-9fb2-3ebc664ed58d&ContentType_id=15d70174-0c41-47c6-9bd5-cc875718b6c3&Group_id=4c543850-0014-4d3c-8f87-0cbbda2e1dc7>

What Does Obama's Second Term Hold for U.S.-Cuba Relations? John Kerry is expected to be confirmed soon as U.S. secretary of state. During his tenure in the Senate, Kerry has criticized U.S. programs aimed at fostering democracy in Cuba and proposed opening up U.S. travel to the island. Will having Kerry as secretary of state affect U.S. relations with Cuba? Will President Barack Obama's first-term moves to ease some travel and remittance restrictions for Cuban-Americans lead to additional relaxed restrictions in his second term? To what extent would looser restrictions toward Cuba present business opportunities for U.S. firms? Which industries could benefit? **While** John **Kerry's views on U.S.–Cuba relations have favored engagement** over isolation, **ultimate authority rests with a White House that has proceeded cautiously on Cuba during** President **Obama**'s first term. Aside from easing some travel restrictions, there have been only two emergent themes on Cuba policy: support for private-sector efforts to increase the flow of information to the Cuban people; and support for private economic activity on the island. **Cuba policy changes still require expenditures of political capital disproportionate to the island's strategic and economic importance. Barring game-changing developments—such as release of USAID subcontractor** Alan **Gross**—executive action during Obama's second term will likely focus on furthering goals laid out during his first. Here, however, John Kerry's leadership could prove vital and create new opportunities for U.S. business. In 2009 the White House directed the Treasury and Commerce departments—in consultation with State—to authorize U.S. telecommunications firms to negotiate international roaming agreements with Cuba. This would allow U.S. travelers to use their cell phones on the island and presumably increase communications flows with Cuba. It would also generate some new revenue for U.S. firms. Three years later, there's still no agreement—partly because federal agencies haven't clearly communicated how they will handle industry proposals to establish one. This issue may seem insignificant, but in the context of U.S.–Cuba relations it would be an historic first. Kerry could sit down with industry to revisit this issue to help finally get an agreement signed. Kerry could also encourage the president to make other common-sense, executive-branch changes within the scope of current policy, such as allowing U.S. travelers to access basic financial services and purchase insurance products to ensure their safety and wellbeing while in Cuba; or remove regulatory impediments to U.S. farm exports.

## Links – Mexico

**1NC Mexico Link**

*(slightly different version of this card also in General Links section)*

**Plan specifically derails immigration reform - Economic engagement initiatives PERCEIVED as deprioritizing necessary focus on security issues and drug war while kowtowing to Mexico – perception is key and hardliner target spin control to play on fence sitters largest fears**

**Shear, 13**

(Michael, NYT White house correspondent, 5/5, <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/05/05/world/americas/in-latin-america-us-shifts-focus-from-drug-war-to-economy.html?pagewanted=all>)

Last week, Mr. Obama returned to capitals **in Latin America** with a vastly different message. **Relationships with countries racked by drug violence and organized crime should focus more on economic development** and less on the endless battles against drug traffickers and organized crime capos that have left few clear victors. The countries, Mexico in particular, need to set their own course on security, with the United States playing more of a backing role. **That approach runs the risk of being seen as kowtowing to governments more concerned about their public image than the underlying problems tarnishing it. Mexico,** which **is eager to play up its economic growth, has mounted an aggressive effort to play down its crime problems**, going as far as to encourage the news media to avoid certain slang words in reports. “The problem will not just go away,” said Michael Shifter, president of the Inter-American Dialogue. “**It needs** to be tackled head-on, with a comprehensive **strategy** that includes but goes **beyond stimulating economic growth** and alleviating poverty. **“Obama becomes vulnerable to the charge of downplaying the region’s overriding issue**, **and the chief obstacle to economic progress**,” he added. “It is fine to change the narrative from security to economics as long as the reality on the ground reflects and fits with the new story line.” Administration officials insist that Mr. Obama remains cleareyed about the security challenges, but the new emphasis corresponds with a change in focus by the Mexican government. The new Mexican president, Enrique Peña Nieto, took office in December vowing to reduce the violence that exploded under the militarized approach to the drug war adopted by his predecessor, Felipe Calderón. That effort left about 60,000 Mexicans dead and appears not to have significantly damaged the drug-trafficking industry. In addition to a focus on reducing violence, which **some critics have interpreted as taking a softer line on the drug gangs**, Mr. Peña Nieto has also moved to reduce American involvement in law enforcement south of the border. With friction and mistrust between American and Mexican law enforcement agencies growing, Mr. Obama suggested that **the U**nited **S**tates **would no longer seek to dominate the security agenda**. “It is obviously up to the Mexican people to determine their security structures and how it engages with other nations, including the United States,” he said, standing next to Mr. Peña Nieto on Thursday in Mexico City. “But the main point I made to the president is that we support the Mexican government’s focus on reducing violence, and we look forward to continuing our good cooperation in any way that the Mexican government deems appropriate.” In some ways, conceding leadership of the drug fight to Mexico hews to a guiding principle of Mr. Obama’s foreign policy, in which American supremacy is played down, at least publicly, in favor of a multilateral approach. But **that philosophy could collide with the concerns of lawmakers in Washington, who** have **expressed frustration with what they see as** a **lack of clarity in Mexico’s security plans**. And **security analysts say the entrenched corruption in Mexican law enforcement has long clouded the partnership** with their American counterparts. **Putting Mexico in the driver’s seat** on security **marks a shift in a balance of power** that has always tipped to the United States **and,** analysts said, **will carry political risk as Congress negotiates an immigration bill that is expected to include provisions for tighter border security.** “If there is a **perception in the U.S. Congress that security cooperation is weakening**, that **could play into the hands of those who oppose immigration reform,” said** Vanda Felbab-**Brown, a counternarcotics expert at** the **Brookings** Institution in Washington. “Realistically, the border is as tight as could be and there have been few spillovers of the violence from Mexico into the U.S.,” she added, but **perceptions count in Washington “and can be easily distorted**.” “**Drugs** today **are not very important to the U.S. public over all,”** she added, “**but they are important to committed drug warriors who are politically powerful.”** Representative Michael T. **McCaul**, a Texas Republican who is **chair**man **of the Homeland Security Committee, has warned against** the danger of **drug cartels** forming **alliances with terrorist groups**. “While these threats exist, you would be surprised to find that the administration thinks its work here is done,” he wrote in an opinion article for Roll Call last month, pressing for more border controls in the bill. The Obama administration has said any evidence of such cooperation is very thin, but even without terrorist connections, **drug gangs pose threats to** peace and **security. Human rights advocates said they feared the U**nited **States would ease pressure on Mexico** to investigate disappearances and other abuses at the hands of the police and military, who have received substantial American support. The shift in approach “suggests that the Obama administration either doesn’t object to these abusive practices or is only willing to raise such concerns when it’s politically convenient,” said José Miguel Vivanco, director of Human Rights Watch’s Americas division. Still, administration officials have said there may have been an overemphasis on the bellicose language and high-profile hunts for cartel leaders while the real problem of lawlessness worsens. American antidrug aid is shifting more toward training police and shoring up judicial systems that have allowed criminals to kill with impunity in Mexico and Central America. United States officials said Mr. Obama remains well aware of the region’s problems with security, even as he is determined that they not overshadow the economic opportunities. It is clear Mr. Obama, whatever his words four years ago, now believes there has been too much security talk. In a speech to Mexican students on Friday, Mr. Obama urged people in the two countries to look beyond a one-dimensional focus on what he called real security concerns, saying it is “time for us to put the old mind-sets aside.” And he repeated the theme later in the day in Costa Rica, lamenting that **when it comes to the United States and Central America,** “so **much of the focus ends up being on security**.” “We also have to recognize that problems like narco-trafficking arise in part when a country is vulnerable because of poverty, because of institutions that are not working for the people, because young people don’t see a brighter future ahead,” Mr. Obama said in a news conference with Laura Chinchilla, the president of Costa Rica.

**Mexico Economic Engagement Link**

#### Engaging Mexico drains PC

Farnsworth 12 – VP of the Council of the Americas and Americas Society (Eric, “The United States and Mexico: The Path Forward”, Nov 30, <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/security/news/2012/11/30/46430/the-united-states-and-mexico-the-path-forward/>, CMR)

The election of Enrique Peña Nieto and the re-election of President Obama mean that the U.S.-Mexican relationship has a unique opportunity to grow closer and bring numerous benefits to both sides of the border. To fully appreciate this unique opportunity, both sides must invest political capital and be prepared to engage domestic public opinion when it comes to explaining why our countries are united by much more than a fence.

#### Real changes require PC – failed rhetorical commitments prove

Corcoran 9 (Patrick, “Shift in Tone Not Enough for U.S.-Mexico Relations”, April 16, <http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/3618/shift-in-tone-not-enough-for-u-s-mexico-relations>, CMR)

But while the shift in tone is laudable, the impact of rhetoric alone will be limited in both duration and depth. Unfortunately, while Obama's team has reinforced cooperative security measures already in place to help Mexico battle against drug cartels, it has remained unwilling to commit to more fundamental changes in U.S. policy. Among such possible transformations to the bilateral status quo, two U.S. legislative initiatives stand out for the impact they might have on the drug war in Mexico. ¶ First, the Obama administration should pursue a new ban on assault weapons, much like the one that expired in 2004, but without the loopholes that allowed slightly modified machine guns to qualify as legal. Since Mexico is already overrun with weapons, such a ban wouldn't drive violence down overnight, and the larger criminal organizations would still be able to find willing suppliers elsewhere. However, a strengthened ban would force drug gangs to divert a larger proportion of their profits to weapons purchases, which would make it harder for smaller groups to stockpile arsenals. It would also eventually reduce the number of weapons in the country, making Mexico less prone to outbreaks of warfare between criminal gangs. However, when asked about a new ban last month on Face the Nation, Obama demurred.¶ Second, the Obama administration should seek the legalization of marijuana, which remains the most profitable source of revenue for Mexican smugglers. Polls show that close to half of the U.S. public favors the move, which would have a greater direct impact on the profitability of Mexico's drug gangs than any other single action. A growing chorus of mainstream analysts, including Time's Joe Klein and the Washington Post's Eugene Robinson, has also called for the regulated, legal sale of cannabis in recent weeks. ¶ Yet, when questioned about the possibility of legalizing marijuana at his recent online town hall meeting, Obama -- who has himself admitted to having smoked marijuana -- poked fun at those interested in the issue before summarily dismissing it. The context of the War on Drugs, which demonizes all discussions of legalization, might make such a reaction good politics. But it remains poor policy. ¶ In other realms, Obama has been similarly timid. He has been unwilling to expend political capital to renew a program that would allow Mexican trucks to traverse U.S. roads, much to the dismay of Mexican exporters and NAFTA supporters. More significantly, while Obama has ratcheted up his rhetoric on immigration reform, it remains at best the third-highest priority on his domestic agenda. ¶ All of this means that despite the wave of Mexican enthusiasm for the new U.S. government and the tone it has struck, the bilateral relationship won't differ fundamentally from that under former presidents George W. Bush and Bill Clinton. While Obama and his administration deserve credit for reappropriating the terms of the bilateral conversation, his administration shouldn't be surprised if Mexico soon loses its infatuation with attractive rhetoric wrapped around the same old problems.

**Economic engagement with Mexico is politically divisive**

**Wilson 13** – Associate at the Mexico Institute of the Woodrow Wilson International. Center for Scholars (Christopher E., January, “A U.S.-Mexico Economic Alliance: Policy Options for a Competitive Region,” http://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/new\_ideas\_us\_mexico\_relations.pdf)

At a time when Mexico is poised to experience robust economic growth, a manufacturing renaissance is underway in North America and bilateral trade is booming, **the United States and Mexico have an important choice to make**: sit back and reap the moderate and perhaps temporal benefits coming naturally from the evolving global context , or implement a robust agenda to improve the competitiveness of North America for the long term . **Given that job creation and economic growth in both the United States and Mexico are at stake, t he choice should be simple, but a limited understanding about the magnitude, nature and depth of the U.S.-Mexico economic relationship among the public and many policymakers has made serious action to support regional exporters more politically divisive than it ought to be.**

**Mexico Lx – A2: GOP link turn**

**Not a priority even for GOP supporters and they wont switch votes on immigration anyway**

**Cardenas and Noriega, 12**

Roger F. Noriega, José R. Cárdenas, American Enterprise Institute, 12/5/12

Roger F. Noriega (rnoriega@aei.org) was a senior US State Department official from 2001 to 2005. He is currently a visiting fellow at AEI and managing director of Vision Americas LLC, which represents foreign and domestic clients. José R. Cárdenas (jrc@visionamericas.com) is a contributor to AEI’s Venezuela-Iran Project and a director with Vision Americas, http://www.aei.org/outlook/foreign-and-defense-policy/regional/latin-america/an-action-plan-for-us-policy-in-the-americas/

A Security and Stability Agenda Shared land and maritime borders make security in Western Hemisphere countries a permanent priority for the US government. The security challenges confronting Mexico, Central America, and Venezuela are more dramatic today than in recent memory. In the final year of the George W. Bush administration, **Mexico and the U**nited **S**tates **agreed on** a $1 billion counter-narcotics **assistance** package**. Yet, despite the** enormous **opportunity** this presented to bring Mexico and the United States into a closer **and mutually** beneficial security **cooperation, the aid was** so **slowly delivered** that **Mexicans have been left to wonder if their** raging **drug war is a priority for the U**nited **S**tates. **Conservative lawmakers** **who were the driving force** behind Plan Colombia a decade ago **have been less active on Mexico, focusing instead on border security** as a means **to fight** illegal **immigration and leaving Mexicans to square off with** bloodthirsty **cartels on their own**.

### Border Coop Lx

#### Current US border-security strategy defers to Mexico – engagement risks opening up huge fights due to encroachments from Obama and Nieto

Fox 5/3/13 (“Obama, Peña Nieto Talk Shift In Security Cooperation”, <http://latino.foxnews.com/latino/politics/2013/05/03/obama-pena-nieto-talk-shift-in-security-cooperation/>, CMR)

But being careful not to intrude on the southern neighbor's sovereignty, Obama noted that Mexicans have the right to determine how best to tackle the violence that has plagued their country. He spoke during a press conference Thursday with Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto.¶ Since taking office in December, Peña Nieto has moved to end the widespread access that U.S. security agencies have had in Mexico to tackle the violence that affects both sides of the border. It's a departure from the strategy employed by his predecessor, Felipe Calderon, which was praised by the U.S. but reviled by many Mexicans.¶ "I agreed to continue our close cooperation on security, even as the nature of that cooperation will evolve," Obama said during a joint news conference at Mexico's grand National Palace. "It is obviously up to the Mexican people to determine their security structures and how it engages with the other nations — including the United States."¶ Peña Nieto also downplayed the notion that the new, more centralized arrangement would damage its security partnership with the United States. He said Obama agreed during their private meeting earlier in the day to "cooperate on the basis of mutual respect" to promote an efficient and effective strategy.¶ Obama arrived in Mexico Thursday afternoon for a three-day trip that includes a stop in Costa Rica on Friday. Domestic issues followed the president south of the border, with Obama facing questions in his exchange with reporters about the potential escalation of the U.S. role in Syria, a controversy over contraception access for teenage girls, and the delicate debate on Capitol Hill on an immigration overhaul.¶ The latter issue is being closely watched in Mexico, given the large number of Mexicans who have emigrated to the U.S. both legally and illegally. More than half of the 11 million people in the U.S. illegally are Mexican, according to the Pew Research Center.¶ For Obama, the immigration debate is rife with potential political pitfalls. While he views an overhaul of the nation's patchwork immigration laws as a legacy-building issue, he's been forced to keep a low-profile role in the debate to avoid scaring off wary Republicans.¶ In an effort to court those GOP lawmakers, the draft bill being debated on Capitol Hill focuses heavily on securing the border with Mexico, and makes doing so a pre-condition for a pathway to citizenship for those in the U.S. illegally. But Florida Republican Sen. Marco Rubio, one of the bill's architects, said Thursday that unless the border security measures are made even tougher, the legislation will face tough odds not only in the GOP-controlled House but also in the Democratic-led Senate.¶ The president acknowledged there were some areas along the 2,000-mile border between the U.S. and Mexico where security needs to be tightened. But he gently chided Rubio and other Republicans for putting up obstacles that would derail final legislation.¶ "I suspect that the final legislation will not contain everything I want. It won't contain everything that Republican leaders want, either," Obama said. He added that "what I'm not going to do is to go along with something where we're looking for an excuse not to do it as opposed to a way to do it."¶ Despite the intense interest in the immigration debate among Mexicans, Peña Nieto carefully avoided injecting himself in the issue. While he commended the U.S. for tackling the challenge, he said the congressional debate "is a domestic affair."¶ The new Mexican leader was purposely seeking to avoid the perceived missteps of former Mexican President Vicente Fox, who irked conservatives in the U.S. by lobbying for an immigration overhaul in 2001.¶ Peña Nieto's election brought Mexico's Institutional Revolutionary Party, or PRI, back to power after a decade on the sidelines. The security changes are emblematic of the party's preference for centralized political and bureaucratic control.¶ The arrangement means all contact for U.S. law enforcement will now go through a "single door," according to Mexico's federal Interior Ministry, the agency that controls security and domestic policy. Under the previous policy, FBI, CIA, DEA and Homeland Security had direct access to units of Mexico's Federal Police, army and navy. ¶ U.S. agents worked side by side with those Mexican units in the fight against drug cartels, including the U.S.-backed strategy of killing or arresting top kingpins.¶ Obama lauded his Mexican counterpart for launching bold reforms during his first months in office, not only on security but also the economy. Both leaders have said they want to refocus the U.S.-Mexico relationship on trade and the economy, not the drug wars and immigration issues that have dominated the partnership in recent years.

#### No link turns – Politically charged debate crowds-out perceived benefits

Stratfor 5/2/13 (“Evolving U.S.-Mexico Relations and Obama's Visit”, <http://www.stratfor.com/analysis/evolving-us-mexico-relations-and-obamas-visit>, CMR)

Security Cooperation and Centralization¶ Pena Nieto's predecessor, the National Action Party's Felipe Calderon, focused heavily on Mexico's security challenges and oversaw the sustained military offensive against criminal organizations throughout the country. Pena Nieto has yet to elaborate much on his plans to address the security issues, but he has emphasized the need to combat street violence and kidnappings, while playing down the importance of combating drug trafficking -- a U.S. priority.¶ But ahead of Obama's visit, certain details have emerged indicating that the Pena Nieto administration intends to change the nature of intelligence cooperation between the United States and Mexico. Until now, the two countries' various law enforcement and intelligence agencies have been able to interact directly, but Mexico's interior ministry will begin overseeing all intelligence collaboration.¶ This centralization effort has not been isolated to cooperation with the United States. The Mexican Interior Ministry has also taken charge of the federal police, and Pena Nieto intends to eventually create a national gendarmarie under the interior secretariat in order to fill the role in the drug wars currently played by the Mexican military with a security body better equipped with law enforcement training.¶ Thus, the extent and manner to which this centralization will affect security cooperation with the United States is unclear. But the changes are primarily designed to give Mexico greater control over the intelligence process involved in combating the country's violent gangs. The intention is not to block U.S. collaboration and assistance, but rather to reform existing structures.¶ Domestic Issues, Bilateral Implications¶ While Mexico reorients its internal focus to structural changes that its leaders hope will lay foundations for economic development, the country could also be affected by domestic issues under debate in the United States. For years, Mexico has been pressing the United States to enact stricter gun laws. Though a prominent gun control bill failed in the U.S. Senate on April 17, the issue will likely re-emerge later in 2013, and at least some gun control measures currently enjoy broad popular support. Meanwhile, demographic changes in the United States are driving a debate about immigration reform that, if implemented, would require collaboration with Mexico, many of whose citizens would seek to legalize their residential status in the United States.¶ Though the passage of these reforms will similarly be determined solely by U.S. domestic political factors, their success would be a significant boon for bilateral relations with Mexico. Indeed, for Obama and Pena Nieto, the effects each feel of the other's policy decisions will be magnified by the unique demographic, geographic and economic ties binding their countries. Yet, the domestic environment and political calculations in each country will ultimately shape the effects of this period of political change.¶ The U.S. political decision-making process is largely isolated from international influence, and the Pena Nieto administration likewise appears to be consolidating key policy areas under Mexican control at the expense of U.S. influence. Still, Mexico's steady emergence as an economic power in North America sets the stage for a bilateral relationship much more heavily focused on opportunities for economic cooperation.

## Links – Venezuela

**Laundry List**

**Plan causes huge backlash – multiple reasons: GOP, Appeasement, Cuba Lobby, Committee and Rubio**

**Mazzei, 12**

Patricia, and Erika Bolstad, Miami Herald, 7/11/12, <http://www.miamiherald.com/2012/07/11/v-fullstory/2891728/republicans-attack-obama-for-chavez.html>

Mitt Romney, **GOP howl over** President Barack **Obama’s remark** about Hugo Chávez **Republicans criticize** President **Obama for saying Venezuelan President** Hugo Chávez **has not threatened U.S. national security.** The region’s experts, however, side with Obama. **Republicans, led by** Mitt **Romney and** Florida Sen. Marco **Rubio, pounced on** President Barack **Obama** on Wednesday **after he told** a Miami TV anchor **that Venezuelan** **President** Hugo Chávez **does not pose a “serious” national security threat** to the United States. **Republicans wasted no time in firing up a key South Florida constituency coveted by** both Romney and **Obama: Cuban-American voters** who **hate Chávez for** his **close ties to the Castro regime in Cuba**. “President **Obama hasn’t been paying attention if he thinks that** Hugo **Chávez, with buddies like the regimes in Cuba, Iran, and Syria, drug cartels, arms traffickers, and extremist groups, is not a threat to the U**nited **S**tates,” **said** Rep. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen of Miami, **chair**woman **of the House Foreign Affairs committee** and co-chair of Romney’s National Hispanic Steering Committee. “**I am deeply disappointed that this administration continues to bury its head in the sand about threats to U.S. security**, our interests, and our allies.” **Rubio said Obama “has been living under a rock**” when it comes to Chávez, **and said the president “continues to display an alarmingly naïve understanding of the challenges and opportunities we face in the western hemisphere.” Other Cuban-American lawmakers issued statements in the same critical vein,** and Senate candidate Connie Mack, a **Republican congressman** from Fort Myers, **tied his opponent** Sen. Bill Nelson, D-Fla., **to the president’s remarks.** Experts in the region, though, called Obama’s comments reasonable. Chávez is “certifiable,” with a tremendous ego fueled by the power that comes from sitting on vast oil reserves — but he’s not as dangerous as the leaders of other less friendly regimes, said Riordan Roett, the director of Latin American Studies Program at the School of Advanced International Studies at The Johns Hopkins University. **The Republican criticism is** “just **pure** electoral **politics,**” Roett said. “He poses no security threat to the United States or anyone else,” Roett said. “Hugo Chávez is not going to attack us, he’s not going to occupy our embassy, he’s not going to bomb U.S. planes arriving in Caracas at Maiquetía Airport. He is a loudmouth who enjoys listening to himself, and has built up on the basis of oil revenue, a very, very populist, dependent regime that can’t deliver on basic services, on goods and commodities to his own people.” Here’s what Obama told Oscar Haza, a Spanish-language broadcast journalist and anchor in an interview with Obama that aired Tuesday night on A Mano Limpia (which roughly translates to “The Gloves Are Off”), Haza’s nightly show on WJAN-Channel 41: “We’re always concerned about Iran engaging in destabilizing activity around the globe,” Obama said. “But overall my sense is that what Mr. Chávez has done over the last several years has not had a serious national security impact on us. We have to be vigilant. My main concern when it comes to Venezuela is having the Venezuelan people have a voice in their affairs, and that you end up ultimately having fair and free elections, which we don’t always see.” **Romney called Obama’s comment “stunning and shocking” and said i**n statement **it’s a sign of “a pattern of weakness” in the president’s foreign policy.** “**It is disturbing to see him downplaying the threat posed to U.S. interests by a regime that openly wishes us ill,” Romney said**. “Hugo Chávez has provided safe haven to drug kingpins, encouraged regional terrorist organizations that threaten our allies like Colombia, has strengthened military ties with Iran and helped it evade sanctions, and has allowed a Hezbollah presence within his country’s borders.” White House press secretary Jay Carney declined to answer questions about the president’s remarks. The president’s campaign spokesman, Ben LaBolt, said Romney is only “playing into the hands of Chávez” and his “outdated rhetoric” by giving him any attention. “Because of President Obama’s leadership, our position in the Americas is much stronger today than before he took office,” LaBolt said. “At the same time, Hugo Chávez has become increasingly marginalized and his influence has waned. It’s baffling that Mitt Romney is so scared of a leader like Chávez whose power is fading, while Romney continues to remain silent about how to confront al-Qaeda or how to bring our troops home from Afghanistan.” Michael **Shifter, president of** the Washington D.C.-based think tank **Inter-American Dialogue, cautioned that it’s up to the president to judge** in an election year **whether it’s politically smart to talk about Chávez in a way that draws such heated Republican response** in South Florida — especially considering how valuable the swing state’s votes are to Obama’s prospects.

**Appeasement/Congress Links**

**sparks fierce congressional fight - *extremists control Venezuela debate* and anything short of confrontation gets viewed as appeasement**

**Harper, 10** (liz, Senior Editor @ US Institute for Peace, adjunct fellow at the Council on Hemispheric Affairs, americasquarterly.org contributing blogger based in Washington DC, 12/21, <http://americasquarterly.org/node/2058>)

Venezuela’s Formal Rejection of Ambassador-Designate Larry Palmer The **long-running debate over how to deal with** the irrational and impulsive strongman, **Venezuela**n President Hugo Chávez, **has reached feverish pitch** this winter. The latest casualty in this war of words has become U.S. Ambassador Larry Palmer, the Obama administration's nomination as ambassador to Venezuela. Worse yet, Chávez ultimately got what he wanted out of this latest battle: his choice of who will not be our next Ambassador in Venezuela. On Monday, Venezuela formally told the U.S. to not bother sending Larry Palmer as the next ambassador since he would be asked to return the moment he landed in Caracas. How did this all go down? **Like Cuba, any U.S. move regarding Venezuela involves egos, politics and** fortunately, **some policy**. Naturally, when Palmer went before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee over the summer, the career diplomat—characterized by some at the U.S. Department of State as "not a Washington man"—he already faced an uphill slog. Our **domestic debate over Venezuela** generally **falls into two camps: engagement and confrontation. There are**, of course, **shades of gray and nuances** between the two sides—**though such voices are so often overpowered by the more extreme views. On one side, you have those espousing** "strategic **engagement," keeping in line with** the **Obama** administration's stated foreign policy and national security objectives. In short and broadly speaking, these proponents might argue, with an irrational state, you shouldn't turn your back. Look where that got us with North Korea, Iran and Syria. Instead you want a seat at the table to start a dialogue based on mutual respect and to build on areas of mutual interest. You raise concerns discretely and express disapproval quietly or through third parties. As one person said, engagement should be “subversive," because **you seek to assert positive influence** by being present and **through** cooperation on areas such as **business development, financial opportunities**, or culture and sports. Indeed, Palmer was the right guy to carry out this mission. **But, the engagement policy**, as it is practiced **with Venezuela, seems more like "appeasement," say people clamoring for a tougher approach. After all**, **for years** now, **we have witnessed a democracy's death by a thousand cuts**. This past week, Hugo Chávez got one of his Christmas wishes with the approval of new decree powers, thereby further eroding the country's once well-established institutional checks and balances. Chávez threatens more than human rights and democratic norms; **the U.S. has legitimate national security concerns**, such as **nuclear proliferation, terrorism and narcotrafficking**. Yet, as Chávez runs roughshod over international norms, is the U.S. working to halt the downward spiral? **Those are the broad** brush **strokes of the debate** into which Palmer was tossed.

**opposition to economic engagement in Venezuela is increasing – triggers fight in congress and Israel lobby hates it**

**Farnsworth, 10**

Eric, contributing blogger to americasquarterly.org. He is Vice President of the Council of the Americas in Washington DC, 11/3/10, http://americasquarterly.org/node/1976

Now What? Elections and the Western Hemisphere Tuesday’s election results were not unexpected. The question now is what will they mean **for U.S. policy in the Western Hemisphere. The outlines are already clear: expect a sharper tone across the board of Congressional oversight and initiative toward the Administration in trying to impact policy.** Here are a few predictions for regional policy based on the midterm election results. The new chair of the House Foreign Affairs Committee will be Ileana **Ros-Lehtinen**; the chair of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee will be **Connie Mack. Together with** newly-elected Senator Marco **Rubio, this troika of Florida Republicans may well seek to reverse** the **Obama** Administration’s slow motion **liberalization** of Cuba policy. **Expect** also a **harder line coming from Congress toward Venezuela** **and** the possible **renewal of** an **effort to sanction Venezuela as a state sponsor of terror.** As well, Chairman-To-Be **Ros-Lehtinen has earned strong pro-Israel credentials** and is a strong supporter of Iran sanctions; further **moves of** Brazil or **Venezuela toward Tehran could well prove** to be **a point of friction between the Administration and Congress if the Administration is perceived as downplaying their significance.**

**spun as appeasement – triggers intense fight and derails Obama domestic agenda priorities**

**Dueck, 11**

Colin Dueck,professor at the Department of Public and International Affairs, George Mason University, October 1, 2011

policy review » no. 169, <http://www.hoover.org/publications/policy-review/article/94006>

Look at how **Obama’s strategy of accommodation has played out in relation to** four categories of foreign governments: 1) those essentially hostile to the United States, 2) those who pursue a mixture of strategic rivalry and cooperation, 3) genuine American allies, and 4) Arab governments of varying allegiance. The first category, of **regimes** basically **hostile to the U**nited **S**tates**, includes** the governments of Iran, North Korea, **Cuba, and Venezuela, to name** only four of **the most notable**. Each of **these governments has literally defined itself at a fundamental level by violent opposition to America**. To think that a conciliatory tone, a preliminary concession, or a well-intentioned desire for better relations on the part of a U.S. president by itself will transform that hostility is simply naïve. In the case of Cuba, for example, the Obama administration began by lifting certain economic sanctions, in the hope of seeing some reciprocal concessions from the Castro brothers: political liberalization, an easing of anti-American hostility, anything at all of significance. No such concessions have been made. The case of Iran has already been discussed — Obama reached out to Tehran with great fanfare in 2009, and has received in effect a slap in the face. Both Venezuela’s Hugo Chavez and North Korea’s Kim Jong Il are likewise just as hostile and provocative toward the United States today as they were when George W. Bush was America’s president. This is because the fundamental barrier to friendly U.S. relations with those regimes was never George W. Bush. The fundamental barrier to friendly relations with these regimes is the fact that they are bitterly hostile to the United States. The kinds of **concessions** that Washington would have to offer to win their genuine **accommodation would be** so sweeping, massive, and **unacceptable, from the point of view of any likely U.S. president that they will not be made — and certainly not by** Barack **Obama**. Any smaller concessions from Washington, therefore, are simply pocketed by a hostile regime, which continues along in its basic antipathy toward the United States. So who is supposed to be the target audience here? The true audience and for that matter the ultimate source of these various conciliatory policy initiatives is essentially a small, transnational, North Atlantic class of bien pensant opinion who already share Obama’s core policy priorities in any case. They have rewarded him with their support, as well as with the Nobel Peace Prize. Others internationally are less impressed. And in the meantime, we may have lost something, in terms of the ability to seriously prepare for certain looming security challenges. A primary and continuing emphasis on diplomatic engagement after Iran has repeatedly rebuffed the United States does not help us to prepare for the possibility of a nuclear-armed Iran. A declared commitment to nuclear abolition does nothing to convince other nuclear powers to abandon their own arsenals, and may even be counterproductive in the sense that it deludes important segments of opinion into believing that such declarations actually help to keep the peace. Obama has said from the beginning that the purpose of his more conciliatory foreign policy approach was to bolster American standing in the world, but the definition of international standing has actually been highly self-referential in the direction of aforementioned transatlantic liberal opinion. In many cases overseas, from the perspective of other governments, Obama’s well-intentioned **conciliatory gestures are read as a sign of weakness**, and consequently undermine rather than bolster American standing. In one way, however, **Obama** has already achieved much of what he desired with his **strategy** of accommodation, and that **is to re-orient American** national resources and **attention away from national security concerns and toward** the expansion of **domestic progressive reforms**. He appears to sincerely believe that these liberal domestic initiatives in areas such as health care and finance will also bolster American economic power and competiveness. Actually they will do no such thing, since heavy-handed and constantly changing federal regulations tend to undermine investor confidence as well as long-term U.S. economic growth. But either way, **Obama’s vision of** a more expansive government role in **American society is well on its way to being achieved, without** from his point of view **debilitating debates over major national security concerns**. **In that sense,** especially **if he is reelected** in 2012, several of his **major strategic priorities will have been accomplished**. Any **good strategy must incorporate the possibility of pushback or resistance** from unexpected quarters. As they say in the U.S. military, the enemy gets a vote. So, for that matter, do other countries, whether friendly or not. When things do not go exactly according to plan, any decent strategy and any capable leader adapt. Indeed any decent foreign policy strategy begins with the recognition for backup plans, since inevitably things will not go exactly according to plan. Other countries rarely respond to our initial strategic moves in precisely the way we might wish. The question then becomes: What is plan B? **Obama is tactically very flexible**, but at the level of grand strategy he seems to have no backup plan. There is simply no recognition of the possibility that world politics might not operate on the post-Vietnam liberal assumptions he has imbibed and represented over the years. Obama’s critics often describe him as providing no strong foreign policy leadership. They underestimate him. Actually he has a very definite idea of where he wants to take the United States. **His guiding foreign policy idea is** that of **international accommodation**, sparked by American example. He pursues that overarching concept with great tactical pliability but without any sign of ideological or basic revision since coming into office. Yet empirically, in one case after another, the strategy is not working. This is a kind of leadership, to be sure, but leadership in the wrong direction. **Obama believes that liberal domestic initiatives will bolster American economic power and competitiveness.** How can the Obama administration adapt and adjust to the failures of its strategy of accommodation? It can admit that the attempted diplomatic engagement of Iran has failed, and shift toward a strategy of comprehensive pressure against that regime. It can make it abundantly clear to both the Taliban and al Qaeda that the United States will not walk away from Afghanistan, despite the beginning drawdown. It can start treating Russia as a geopolitical rival, which it is, rather than simply as a diplomatic partner. It can strengthen U.S. missile defenses as a form of insurance against nuclear proliferators. There is a long list of policy recommendations that can be made on specific regional and functional matters, but the prior and most important point is the need for a change in mentality. President Obama needs to stop working on the assumption that U.S. foreign policy concessions or gestures directed at the gallery of elite transatlantic opinion — whether on nuclear arms control, counterterrorism, or climate change — will somehow be reciprocated by specific foreign governments in the absence of some very hard bargaining. He needs to grasp that U.S. strategic disengagement from specific regional theaters, whether promised or underway, is taken as a sign of weakness in those regions and not simply as a sign of benevolent restraint. He needs to recognize that America’s international reputation consists not only of working toward his own definition of the moral high ground, but also very much of a reputation for strength, and specifically of a reputation for the willingness to use force. He needs to stop operating on the premise that past American foreign policy decisions are the ultimate source of much violent discord in the world today. He needs to be willing to divide the international system conceptually and operationally into friends and enemies, as they actually exist, and to support America’s friends while pressuring and opposing its enemies relentlessly. Finally, he needs to admit the limited effect of his own personal charisma on the foreign policies of other governments. The president of the United States is not an international community organizer. If the conceptual framework that underpins Obama’s foreign policy strategy is altered, then better policies will flow on a wide range of specific issues. Obama needs to be willing to support America’s friends while pressuring and opposing its enemies relentlessly. Admittedly, there is little chance that Obama will concede any of this. One of the things we know from historical example is that presidents tend to keep operating on their own inbuilt foreign policy assumptions, even as contrary evidence piles up. It usually takes either a dramatic external shock, or a new administration altogether, to bring about a major revaluation of existing assumptions. Curiously, this resistance to contrary evidence in foreign policy appears to be even truer of highly educated, self-confident, and intelligent people with core ideological convictions — a description that certainly fits President Obama. **Obama is malleable on tactics**, and he takes great care to project an aura of sensible calm, but in truth **he is** a conviction **president powered by** certain core ideological beliefs and **vaulting policy ambitions**. His characteristic response when these core beliefs and ambitions are truly tested by opponents or events is not to bend, but to bristle. He is therefore particularly unlikely to admit or even perceive that a foreign policy strategy based upon faulty assumptions of international accommodation is failing or has failed. Nor is it politically convenient for him to do so. More likely, he will continue along his chosen path, offering nothing more than tactical adjustments, until some truly dramatic event occurs which brings his whole foreign policy strategy into question — an Iranian nuclear test, for example.

**Appeasement/Cuba Lobby Links**

**GOP and Cuba lobby HATE Venezuela and spin plan as appeasement**

**Boothroyd, 12**

Rachel Boothroyd, journalist in Caracas, Venezuela. She contributes to Venezuelanalysis, Pulsamerica and Correo del Orinoco International, and has had pieces published on other sites such as the Latin American Bureau, Green Left Weekly, Znet and Global Research.9/25/12, <http://venezuelanalysis.com/news/7283>

**Republicans Vow to Halt “Policy of Appeasement” in Venezuela** Caracas, September 23 2012 (Venezuelanalysis.com) – Republican nominee for Vice-President of theU.S., Paul Ryan, has vowed that a Romney administration would **get “tough** on Castro, tough on Chavez**” and** to **end** what he described as **a “policy of appeasement” applied by** the **Obama** administration **towards** both Cuba and **Venezuela.** **Ryan made the comments** from the Versailles Restaurant in Miami, Florida last Saturday, where he was **accompanied by staunch members of the anti-Castro lobby, including Republican Representative**, Ileana **Ros-Lehtinen**. Ros-Lehtinen is a member of the Cuban-American Lobby and the Congressional Cuban Democracy Caucus; organisations which claim to be aimed at speeding up Cuba’s “transition to democracy”. "In a Mitt Romney administration, we will not keep **practising this** policy of **appeasement,** we will be tough on this brutal dictator (Castro). **All it has done is reward more despotism**... We will help those pro-democracy groups. **We will be tough on** Castro, tough on **Chavez**. And it's **because we know that's the right policy** for our country,” **said Ryan**. The nominee had reportedly travelled to Florida in a bid to win over the majority Latino vote two months ahead of the US elections. Florida is currently thought to be a “swing state” and could prove a determining vote for the overall election results. Results of a recent voter intention poll in the state carried out by NBC news show that Obama currently has a 5% lead over Romney, with a voting intention of 49% to 44%. ‘I learned from these friends, from Mario (Diaz-Balart), from Lincoln (Diaz-Balart), from Ileana (Ros-Lehtinen), just how brutal the Castro regime is, just how this president's policy of appeasement is not working. They've given me a great education, lots of us in Congress, about how we need to clamp down on the Castro regime,” said Ryan. **According to Ros-Lehtinen, Ryan is now a “loyal friend” to those who campaign on Cuba-related political issues**. Ryan's statements have caused some Democrats to accuse him of hypocrisy after he appears to have dramatically changed his stance on Cuba-US relations. Prior to 2007, the Republican had called for “free trade” between all nations, which included voting to lift the trade embargo on Cuba. "To paraphrase President Clinton, it takes real brass to vote three times against economic sanctions on the Cuban regime and then come to Little Havana and ask Cuban-Americans for their vote," said Giancarlo Sopo, a Cuban-American supporter who told the US' Sun Sentinel that he would vote for Obama. "It's one thing to have a genuine disagreement with someone on a policy. It's something else to change your position from one day to the next just to pander in order to win votes,” added Sopo. Recently leaked footage of a meeting between Romney and party donors also showed the presidential hopeful **lambasting Obama for believing that** “his magnetism and his charm, and his persuasiveness is so compelling that he can sit down with people like Putin and Chávez and Ahmadinejad, and that they'll find that we're such wonderful people that they'll go on with us, and **they'll stop doing bad things”.** The leaked recording also shows Romney referring to Iranian President Ahmadinejad as a “crazed fanatic” and Iranian mullahs as “crazy people”. He also commented that, in his view, the Palestinian people have “no interest whatsoever in establishing peace”. With the presidential elections now drawing near, **the Republican party** is beginning to increasingly outline its prospective domestic and **foreign policy**, which Romney has said would be principally based on an attempt to implement a neo-liberal “Reagan economic zone” in Latin America and other regions, such as the Middle East. The Republican presidential candidate **has been outspoken in** his **criticism of the “anti-American” views purported by the governments of Venezuela,** Cuba and Iran **and has described them as one of the biggest threats to the United States today.** Earlier in July, Romney b**randed the Venezuelan government as a “threat to national security” and accused the country's president,** Hugo Chavez, **of “spreading dictatorships** and tyranny throughout Latin America”. **The R**epublican **N**ational **C**ommittee also **circulated a video of Obama shaking hands with Chavez at the OAS “Summit** of the Americas” in Trinidad and Tobago 2009 at the same time. Romney has **often claimed that** the leader of **Venezuela**'s Bolivarian revolution **has links to “terrorist” organisations such as Hezbollah and has access to weapons that could “harm the US**”. He has never presented any evidence in support of these accusations.

**Powerful cuba lobby hates Venezuela economic engagement – even under maduro**

**Kozloff, 13** (Nikolas, doctorate in Latin American history from Oxford University, author of Hugo Chavez: Oil, Politics and the Challenge to the U.S. (Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), Revolution! South America and the Rise of the New Left (Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), No Rain in the Amazon: How South America's Climate Change Affects the Entire Planet (Palgrave Macmilan, 2010), Huffington Post, 4/14, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/nikolas-kozloff/maduro-elections-venezuela_b_3078387.html>)

Déjà Vu? **Washington's War on Cuba and Venezuela**: From the Kissinger Files to 'Cable Gate' If the polls are to be believed, Hugo **Chávez's successor** Nicolás **Maduro will** probably **defeat the** political **opposition** in Sunday's presidential election, thus **securing and solidifying Cuban-Venezuelan ties yet further**. **Such an outcome will come as a severe disappointment to Washington**, **which has spent the better part of 40 years trying to prevent such a diplomatic alliance from developing** in the first place. **For evidence of U.S. paranoia over Cuba, one need** **only consult** the so-called "Kissinger files," sensitive State Department **cables recently made accessible** by whistle-blowing outfit WikiLeaks. **The correspondence**, which dates between 1973 and 1976, **underscores** Henry Kissinger's **single-minded obsession with quarantining Cuba lest Castro's influence be felt far afield.** In late 1973, U**.S. diplomats expressed concern about Venezuelan moves to end Cuba's diplomatic isolation**, and were particularly worried that Caracas might "put together Organization of American States [OAS] majority in support resolution permitting reestablishment relations with Cuba." Washington was also perturbed by reports that Venezuelan Navy vessels had departed for Cuba in order to load up on large shipments of sugar, **and** diplomats **contemplated a** possible **cutoff of aid to Caracas in retaliation. Not only had the State Department grown alarmed** about such developments, **but rightist anti-Castro exiles were becoming restive as well**. According to the U.S. Embassy in Caracas, the **exiles were "appalled**" at the prospect that COPEI, the current party in power, might renew relations with Cuba. In an ominous move, the exiles planned to publish full page newspaper ads against the COPEI administration. Hoping to punish COPEI at the polls, exiles threw their support to opposing party Acción Democrática (or AD) in the 1973 presidential election. Ultimately, the Americans noted, such support proved critical and "**highly influential Cuban-Venezuelan entrepreneurs, backed by Cuban money from Miami" helped** AD candidate Carlos Andrés Pérez **secure** an **electoral victory**. The Rise of CAP If Kissinger or the Cuban exile community however hoped that Pérez, sometimes known simply as "CAP," would prove amenable to their designs they would be sorely disappointed. History has not been kind to CAP, largely due to the latter's second and disastrous presidency which lasted from 1989 to 1993, during which time the veteran politician followed the diktats of the International Monetary Fund and nearly drove Venezuela to the point of social collapse. Nevertheless, during his first incarnation in the 1970s CAP was regarded as a nationalist and something of a galvanizing figure on the Third World circuit. From 1974 to 1979, during his first presidency, CAP nationalized U.S. oil companies and oversaw a program of massive social spending. Writing to Kissinger in Washington, **the U.S. ambassador in Caracas fretted that Venezuela now had "the economic strength and political leadership** in president Pérez **to make her will felt beyond her borders**." Indeed, the diplomat added, "the energy crisis and president Carlos Andrés Pérez's electoral victory in December 1973 coincided and together have changed Venezuela's perception of herself and her world role." Just like Chávez some 20 years later, CAP was "rapidly emerging as a hemisphere figure." Taking advantage of windfall oil prices, CAP had turned Venezuela into a large international donor of development assistance. Personally, the ambassador feared that CAP had grown too large for his britches as the youthful firebrand politician was fast becoming "a Latin American spokesman for the developing third world countries vis-a-vis the developed nations, especially the Unites States." Reading through the Kissinger files, **one is possessed with an incredible sense of déjà vu.** Combing through paranoid U.S. telegrams, it's easy to imagine that diplomats might have been referring not to CAP but to charismatic Hugo Chávez. Indeed, **if anything the correspondence underscores just how hostile Washington has been to any nationalist politician emerging in Venezuela, particularly if such a figure threatened U.S. priorities** in the Caribbean. **Specifically, U.S. diplomats and anti-Castro exiles worried that CAP might use his newfound diplomatic clout to edge closer to Fidel.**

**Congress and GOP backlash and media spin ensure perceived as appeasement, weak on security and soft on Castro– also a flip flop -**

**Robertson, 12**

Ewan Robertson, 4/11/12, Latin America Bureau analyst @ Venezuala Analysis, http://venezuelanalysis.com/analysis/6916

**As both countries head toward** important presidential **elections** this year, the United States has been intensifying its interventionist policy in Venezuela. However, **US attempts to influence Venezuela**’s domestic politics while **casting it a “rogue state”** on an international level, is leaving the Obama administration increasingly out-of-sync with Latin America’s new political reality. US Intervention in Venezuela Since the election of President Hugo Chávez in 1998, US policy has aimed at removing the Venezuelan president from power and ending the Bolivarian Revolution which he leads. This policy has included support by the Bush presidency for the short-lived April 2002 coup in Venezuela, which failed after mass protests returned Chávez to power. Since then the US has focused on nurturing Venezuela’s conservative opposition, channelling over US$100 million to groups opposed to Chávez since 2002. Meanwhile **Washington and US** corporate mass **media have attempted to de-legitimise** his **government internationally** in a propaganda campaign, **portraying Venezuela as a threat** to the US and its president as a “dangerous dictator” who has trampled upon democracy and human rights. Any hopes that the **Obama** administration would usher a new era of respect for Venezuelan sovereignty have long been dashed, with intervention intensifying as Venezuela’s October 7th presidential election draws closer and Chavez seeks his third term in office. In the last twelve months the US government has **imposed sanctions on Venezuela’s** state **oil company** PDVSA for trading with Iran, **expelled the Venezuelan consul** in Miami based on a suspect documentary **implicating the Venezuelan diplomat in plotting a cyber-attack against the US, and publicly criticised the appointment of Venezuela’s new Defence Minister** Henry Rangel Silva. While direct **US actions have maintained a constant rhythm of pressure against Venezuela**, Washington’s hopes of removing Chávez from power undoubtedly lie in the possibility of the conservative Democratic Unity Table (MUD) opposition coalition defeating Chávez in this year’s presidential election. According to investigative journalist Eva Golinger, the US is providing the opposition in Venezuela with political advice and financial support to the tune of US$20 million $20 million this year. This funding for anti-Chávez groups comes from the US national budget, State Department-linked agencies, the National Endowment for Democracy (NED) and USAID, along with the US Embassy in Caracas. A curious detail suggests that the US Embassy has become a key conduit for the distribution of this money. While the Embassy currently only maintains a Charge D’Affairs responsible for diplomatic operations, and overall staff levels remain unchanged, the Embassy budget jumped from almost $16 million in 2011 to over $24 million for 2012, an unexplained increase of over $8 million. Washington has long worked to see the development of a united Venezuelan opposition capable of defeating Chávez. With the current MUD coalition displaying relative unity behind opposition presidential candidate Henrique Capriles Radonski, and the still popular Chávez currently undergoing treatment for cancer, the US is likely hoping 2012 is the year to see an end to Chávez’s administration. Indeed, the make-up of Venezuela’s opposition reads like a “who’s who” of figures who have received advice and financial support from US sources over the previous decade. Several of those who ran in the opposition’s February primary elections to elect the MUD presidential candidate have ties with US financial aid, including the winner Radonski. His political party Primero Justicia has been a key recipient of funding and political training since its founding in 1999, which has helped it to grow into a national force. US funding has also followed fellow primaries candidate Leopoldo López throughout his political career, first in Primero Justicia, then in Un Nuevo Tiempo from 2002, before receiving NED and USAID funding to support his own organisation Voluntad Popular. MUD National Assembly deputy and primaries candidate Maria Machado Corina has also received heavy US financial support, as well as holding a private meeting with George W Bush in 2004. Machado has recently been appointed as a coordinator for Radonski’s “Tricolour Command” presidential election campaign, while Leopoldo López is now a member of the Radonski campaign’s select Political Strategic Command. The Political Strategic Command is headed by experienced opposition figure Professor Ramón Guillermo Aveledo, who with his close political colleagues “assists US sponsors in pouring money into the MUD,” according to analyst Nil Nikandrov. The importance of US funding in helping to shape the current Venezuelan opposition should not be underestimated. Indeed, according to US Embassy cables released by Wikileaks, in 2009 US Embassy chargé d’affaires John Caulfield argued for increased US funding of opposition groups, as “without our continued assistance, it is possible that the organizations we helped create ... could be forced to close...Our funding will provide those organizations a much-needed lifeline”. Another aspect of **Washington’s approach to Venezuela** moving into 2012 **has been the increase of aggressive rhetoric designed to de-legitimise the government** and open the possibility of more direct intervention. At a special Organisation of American States (OAS) session held in Washington in March, **Democrat Congressman** Eliot E**ngel said Venezuelan democracy was being “trampled**” by the Chávez administration **and advocated a “robust” OAS** **mission** be sent to the country to monitor the October presidential elections. **Not to be outdone by their Democratic counterparts, Republicans have continued to wind up the rhetorical dial on Venezuela**. In a presidential nomination debate in Florida this January, Mitt Romney **made a commitment to “punish those** who are **following”** Hugo **Chávez and his ally** Fidel **Castro,** ex-president of Cuba. **He claims that Obama has “failed to respond with resolve”** to Chávez’s growing international influence, **arguing** in his October 2011 foreign policy white paper foreign policy white paper that he would “chart **a different course” in US policy toward Venezuela** **and other leftist governments in Latin America.** Of course, US foreign policy has nothing to do with concern for democracy nor fabrications that Venezuela is involved in plotting an attack against the US.

**Nationalized industries and trade ties ensure economic engagement can’t avoid backlash as soft on Venezuela regime, national security, Cuba and terrorism**

**Robertson, 12**

Ewan Robertson, 4/11/12, Latin America Bureau analyst @ Venezuala Analysis, http://venezuelanalysis.com/analysis/6916

Venezuela is one of the region’s most vibrant democracies, witnessing a huge increase in political participation in the previous decade, both in internationally-certified free and fair elections and in new grassroots forms, such as the thousands of communal councils which have sprung up around the country. **Figures in Washington routinely ignore the facts** and the evidence **regarding Venezuela**, for example never mentioning the Chilean-based Latinobarometro regional poll in which Venezuelan citizens regularly demonstrate they have one of the highest levels of support for democracy, and satisfaction with how their democracy works in practice, in Latin America. Rather, **the issue for policy makers in Washington** is that since the arrival of Chávez **Venezuela has refused to play its** designated **role** within US imperial strategy. That is, to offer a reliable supply of cheap oil controlled by US companies, to act as a market for US-based private foreign investment, and to conduct itself as a submissive ally in US diplomacy. It is the Chávez administration’s **policies of national control over oil** and using the resource to fund social programmes, **nationalising strategically important industries, and vocally opposing US foreign policy** while pursuing regional integration on principles contrary to “free trade” that **have made Venezuela a “problem” for US foreign policy.** The Regional Dynamic **One of the** Chávez’s administration’s **key regional** integration **initiatives is the** Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America (**ALBA), established by Cuba and Venezuela** in 2004 **as an alternative to US free trade agreements** by **emphasising mutual solidarity and joint development** between member states. The group now contains eight members in Latin America and the Caribbean. Venezuela has also reached out to the Caribbean with the Petrocaribe initiative, in which Venezuela sells oil at preferential rates to participating nations to support their development, with 18 Caribbean states now participating. **The US has responded by trying to isolate Venezuela** and discredit the ALBA. **Romney** has **described it as a “virulently anti-American** ‘Bolivarian’ **movement across Latin America that seeks to undermine** institutions of **democratic governance** and economic opportunity”. Meanwhile, **Council of Foreign Relations** analyst Joe Hirst rather fancifully **tried to paint the organisation**’s inclusion of social movements **as a mechanism for promoting international terrorism**, using information from the long-discredited Farc laptops . **The US has** also **applied diplomatic pressure to discourage other states from strengthening ties with Venezuela.** These have included using intimidation and diplomatic manoeuvres to try to prevent an alliance between Nicaragua and Venezuela after the 2006 election of leftist Daniel Ortega to the Nicaraguan presidency, and using threats and pressure against Haiti in 2006-7 to scupper the Préval government’s plan to join Petrocaribe. This strategy failed, with Nicaragua joining the ALBA at Ortega’s inauguration in early 2007 and the first Petrocaribe oil shipment reaching Haiti in March 2008.

**Cuba fears drive US politics on Venezuela policy and opposition to the plan**

**Kozloff, 13** (Nikolas, doctorate in Latin American history from Oxford University, author of Hugo Chavez: Oil, Politics and the Challenge to the U.S. (Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), Revolution! South America and the Rise of the New Left (Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), No Rain in the Amazon: How South America's Climate Change Affects the Entire Planet (Palgrave Macmilan, 2010), Huffington Post, 4/14, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/nikolas-kozloff/maduro-elections-venezuela_b_3078387.html>)

**Ratcheting up Pressure on Cuba** In May, 1974 **the U.S. ambassador in Caracas confronted** the Venezuelan Foreign Minister **with reports** **claiming that Venezuela sought to import sugar from Cuba**. The ambassador explained that he would be "glad to explore ways and means of trying to find additional sugar for Venezuela from countries other than Cuba." Defiantly, CAP shot back that "he intended to go ahead with trade exchanges, including the sale of Venezuelan rice for Cuban sugar." Sure enough, in early 1975 the U.S. Embassy noted that a Cuban vessel had loaded up on Venezuelan rice at a local port. **Even more seriously, the Americans fretted that CAP might be tempted to ship oil to Cuba** in the event that OAS sanctions were removed. Already, the Soviets were interested in decreasing Cuban dependence on oil transported from the USSR, and indeed Pérez reportedly related in private that Moscow had "been pressing him" to ship oil to the Communist island nation. In late 1976, CAP followed up by traveling to the U.S.S.R. where he inked a deal to export oil to Cuba. On the diplomatic front meanwhile, CAP angered the Americans by resuming relations with Cuba. In Caracas, the Cubans opened a new embassy and staff reportedly included five known intelligence officers. Cuban news agency Prensa Latina meanwhile expanded its activities greatly in Venezuela. In **Washington**, Kissinger **grew alarmed that Venezuela** and other sympathetic nations **might move to end the sanctions regime on Cuba**, and the Secretary therefore instructed his staff to delay any such vote at the OAS. Hardly deterred, CAP went ahead and organized an OAS conference in Quito in November, 1974. However, when CAP failed to obtain the necessary votes, the Venezuelan took out his frustrations on the Americans, remarking indignantly that Washington had bullied certain nations from either abstaining or voting against the OAS initiative. CAP Reacts to Posada Attack Naively perhaps, CAP told U.S. diplomats that he was interested in becoming a kind of "bridge" between Washington and unfriendly Latin governments. Privately, American officials wrote that Venezuela, a major oil supplier to the U.S., was "far too important to allow us to drift into an adversary relationship." "If we choose openly to combat greater Latin American unity," the U.S. ambassador wrote, "the U.S. risks harming its highly important interests in Venezuela and exacerbating its relations with the hemisphere." Whatever the feelings over at the State Department, however, the CIA might have had other ideas in mind. **Still smarting** from CAP's betrayal, **anti-Castro Cubans plotted** **against** the island nation. One such figure was Cuban-born Luis Posada Carriles, a longtime **CIA asset**. During the 1970s Posada **moved to Venezuela** where he oversaw U.S. intelligence operations. He is thought to be responsible for the worst terrorist attack in the hemisphere at the time, a hit on Cubana flight 455 which departed Caracas en route to Cuba in October, 1976. After a brief stopover in Barbados, the plane exploded in midair, killing all 73 passengers aboard. Officially, Posada was no longer in the employ of the CIA at the time of the bombing, having left the agency in July. There's no evidence that the CIA directly orchestrated the plot, though records show that Posada may have notified the agency in advance that was a bomb was set to go off. In Caracas meanwhile, the government began to suspect that the U.S. was engaged in foul play. Dismissing Cuban claims of U.S. destabilization as propaganda, American diplomats assured the Venezuelans, rather unconvincingly, that there was "no conspiracy underway to destabilize anything." Ironic Coda Though his administration was dogged by allegations of corruption, CAP still had enough credibility to run for a second term in office in 1988. Campaigning again with the AD on a nationalist platform, CAP was elected to the presidency once more but promptly reversed course and adopted more pro-U.S. policies favorable to the International Monetary Fund. In 1992, CAP faced down a military coup orchestrated by none other than Hugo Chávez and others. Though Chávez was imprisoned, the paratrooper later ran successfully for president. In 1998, Chávez was democratically elected and split apart the corrupt two party AD-COPEI system. Ironically, even though Chávez spent the better part of his career deploring CAP's excesses, the former military officer carried out a very similar foreign policy predicated on opening up relations with Cuba and rhetorically challenging the U.S. If anything, Washington made things worse at this point by seeking to unseat Chávez, and drove Venezuela to pursue even closer links with Cuba. That, at least, is the impression one gets from reading yet another batch of sensitive U.S. correspondence released by WikiLeaks and known as "Cable-Gate." From CAP to Chávez Carrying on from CAP's earlier opening in the 1970s, Chávez opened up regular commercial and military flights between Cuba and Venezuela. In a further blow, Cuba extended its influence at Venezuelan ports. Perhaps even more seriously, Chávez was apparently so taken with the Castro brothers that he consulted directly with Cuban intelligence officers without even bothering to vet the reporting through his own intelligence services. Even as diplomatic relations improved with Cuba, daily dealings with the U.S. Embassy in Caracas took a complete nosedive, as I explain in a recent al-Jazeera column. WikiLeaks cables also illuminate a scheme which led to the exchange of discounted Venezuelan oil for Cuban assistance in the health sector. In an echo meanwhile of earlier press openings under CAP, Venezuela and Cuba now provide joint support for a hemispheric-wide news channel, Telesur. Lastly, and perhaps most importantly in light of Sunday's presidential election, the Americans suspected that Cuba provided key expertise to Chávez on how to expand Venezuela's national electoral registry. It is a fitting irony that to this day, the Posada case continues to fester and, if anything, has only served to bring Cuba and Venezuela closer together. Indeed, both countries have sought to extradite Posada, who currently resides openly in Miami. During the recent presidential campaign, Chávez heir Maduro even claimed that Posada was linked to a group of mercenaries who are intent on assassinating him. Assessing Kissinger Files and Cable-Gate **Looking back upon Washington's 40-year campaign to roll back an incipient Cuban-Venezuelan alliance, one is struck by a sense of profound political** and diplomatic **waste,** not to mention the State Department's skewed moral compass. From the Kissinger files to Cable-Gate, America's counter-productive campaign only served to inflame public opinion and, if anything, made Venezuela even more nationalistic by the time of Chávez's arrival on the scene in the 1990s. If **Maduro** wins on Sunday, as expected, Chávez's heir apparent **will probably deepen Cuba ties even further,** thus demonstrating once again the complete and utter bankruptcy of U.S. foreign policy.

**Israel/Cuba Lobby Links**

**Triggers intense opposition from both Israel and Cuba lobbies and their Congressional allies**

**Madsen, 11**

Wayne Madsen, Investigative journalist, author and syndicated columnist. Has some twenty years experience in security issues. As a U.S. Naval Officer, he managed one of the first computer security programs for the U.S. Navy. He has been a frequent political and national security commentator on ABC, NBC, CBS, PBS, CNN, BBC, Al Jazeera, and MS-NBC. He has been invited to testify as a witness before the US House of Representatives, the UN Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda, and an terrorism investigation panel of the French government. A member of the Society of Professional Journalists (SPJ) and the National Press Club., 6/20/11, http://www.strategic-culture.org/news/2011/06/20/the-outsourcing-of-influence-peddling-to-the-israeli-lobby.html

T**he confluence of the Israel Lobby with pressure groups** such as those that support the Saakashvili regime in Georgia **is not an isolated situation**. Before the rise to power of the Justice and Development Party (AK Party) of Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan in Turkey, Israel could rely on the support of successive Turkish governments. Turkey, in turn, established its own Washington-based lobbying group, the American Turkish Council, which was modeled on the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC). It was recently learned from Turkish government officials in Washington that the secret network of Turkish military officers, politicians, intelligence officers, professors, and journalists known as “Ergenekon,” which plotted a series of coups against independent-minded Turkish governments, was a construct of the CIA and Mossad. An in-depth investigation of the Ergenekon network conducted by the Turkish intelligence service discovered that many of the key players in Ergenekon were Dönme, the descendants of Turkish Jews who converted to Islam and, to varying degrees, now practice a combination of Kabbalah Judaism and Islamic Sufism while remaining secular and Turkish nationalist in the mold of Turkish state founder Kemal Ataturk. Similarly, **the Israel Lobby has made common cause with the right-wing Cuban exile community in Florida, which has become as influential in the politics of south Florida as the many Jews and Israelis who live there. The convergence of interests of pro-Israelis and Cuban** Gusano **exiles can best be seen in the current chair of the House Foreign Relations Committee, Representative** Ileana **Ros-Lehtinen**, who represents a congressional district in south Florida. **Ros-Lehtinen**, who is **of Cuban Jewish descent, is one of AIPAC’s** and the ADL’s **best friends in Congress. She is also a vociferous opponent of the governments of Venezuela** and Nicaragua, both of **which have severed diplomatic relations with Israel** and have recognized the independence of Abkhazia, **to the dismay of Israel, AIPAC**, and the ADL. While Ros-**Lehtinen rattles sabers against Venezuela**, Nicaragua, Ecuador, Brazil, Argentina, Bolivia, Uruguay, **and other Latin American nations** that have recognized Palestine within its 1967 borders, she supports continued U.S. military assistance to Colombia, Honduras, Costa Rica, and Panama, Israel’s last four remaining allies in Latin America. Ros-Lehtinen, while **decrying** alleged **human rights “abuses” in Venezuela** and Nicaragua, is silent on actual abuses in Colombia, where Israelis routinely supply weapons and advisers to the government in its inhumane war with the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), peasants, and labor unionists. The trial in New York of Russian air cargo services owner Viktor Bout for allegedly trying to sell weapons to the FARC is one outcome of the strategic alliance between Israel, its U.S. Lobby, and the right-wing Latin American exiles and intelligence operatives who call Miami their home. The conviction and imprisonment of former Yukos owner Mikhail Khodorkovsky, considered a major agent-of-influence for Israel in Russia and a one-time potential President of Russia, has placed Russia in the same category as **Venezuela**, Nicaragua, Abkhazia, Turkey, and other nations that have **incurred the ire of the Israel Lobby either directly or via outsourcing deals made with strategic allies** such as the Georgians, **Cuban exiles**, or, now, in the case of Turkey, the Armenians. In the past, AIPAC always ensured that “Armenian genocide” resolutions failed in the U.S. Congress, a payback for Turkey’s support for Israel. With Turkey adopting an independent foreign policy, AIPAC and the ADL are now strategically allied with the Armenian lobby to push for Armenian genocide resolutions in Washington and elsewhere.

**Appeasement links**

**Engagement opponents control the debate on venezuela**

**Harper, 10** (liz, Senior Editor @ US Institute for Peace, adjunct fellow at the Council on Hemispheric Affairs, americasquarterly.org contributing blogger based in Washington DC, 12/21, <http://americasquarterly.org/node/2058>)

It's not clear whether **some sought to** use the QFR to **strong arm** the State Department to articulate or take **tougher positions, and thereby bolster** Palmer's confirmation prospects and **support on the heels of** his "**weak" hearing performance.** Alternatively, perhaps the QFR was publicized to thwart his prospects entirely. Who knows; at this stage, it's irrelevant. What's very relevant are the unfolding consequences of the QFR mishandling. First and foremost, Palmer got rolled. A dedicated Foreign Service officer was not treated with due professionalism and respect. We will not know how great he would have been in Venezuela. Second, the State Department on this matter appears naive, indecisive and disorganized. Third, **critics who never wanted ANY ambassador**—and certainly NOT Palmer—**in Caracas, succeeded**. As did Chávez, for the short term. To take up the second point, **the State Department appears to have different and confused messages on Venezuela**. The ostensible example of this is the two messages of Larry Palmer's Senate testimony versus his answers to the QFR. **What can be said publicly and on the record regarding Venezuela? Beyond talking with a low voice on the safest matters, it is not clear**. Is such timidity to Chávez' bluster necessary? The next step will be to see whether the State Department will go bold and call Venezuelan Ambassador to the U.S. Bernardo Alvarez a persona non grata, or take a softer approach and cancel his visa. Alvarez had been back home, and over the weekend, it was said he was not planning to return to Washington DC—already one move ahead of the anticipated reciprocation to Palmer's rejection. It was in Chávez’s best interests to welcome Palmer, as he wanted to work with Venezuelans, and help ease the growing tensions between the two countries. But now, the State Department will have to rethink this, and find another person...most likely with a stronger track record on human rights and democracy. Perhaps we should accept that playing nice and fair with an irrational actor like Chávez is not likely to yield positive results. At the end of the day, **we've been backed into a corner to put forward a tougher ambassador**, and not Palmer, who was our first pick. **Does this mean likewise that** our **policy of engagement must be altered**? Are we acting in response to Venezuela's moves? **In this context, Chávez, and** some **conservative critics here, are setting the terms of U.S. policy.** This debacle also illustrates the express need for the State Department to complete its review of Venezuela policy and clarify its positions. **The QFR mishandling is a symptom of the bigger issue: uniting our various agencies to craft a coherent message and policy on Venezuela**. What are the "red lines" of what we'll tolerate from Venezuela? When one of our career diplomats goes on record saying that Venezuela's National Guard is involved in narcotrafficking, provides safe haven to terrorists like the FARC, imprisons judges for ruling against Chávez, why is the State Department not publicizing those concerns? Until now, the State Department had been keeping its profile too low for anyone's good. Ostensibly that of Ambassador Palmer. At this point, why is it a mistake to outline on record ways in which the Venezuelan government is breaking very basic standards of human rights and hemispheric security? Just some open and disquieting questions. At the least, the State Department needs to figure out what its basic message is, and then put it out there with a unified voice, loud and clear. This could go far to improve its public outreach and image. But while silence continues, **it seems that the Venezuelans have settled the U.S. debate: this kind of "engagement" will not get us where we want to be**. Chávez is antithetical to our democratic values and security concerns. He is moving full steam down the field, while we sit on the sidelines. Time to play.

**Perceived as weak appeasement – crushes Obama PC and means plan can never be a win**

**Mead, 10** (Walter Russell, Senior Fellow Council Foreign Relations, Prof Foreign affairs @ Bard, 3/31, http://blogs.the-american-interest.com/wrm/2010/03/31/kicked-by-the-great-white-north/

The policy of slapping friends seems not to be working very well; the policy of kissing up to the bad guys has been even less of a success. North Korea, **Cuba, Venezuela** and Iran **have blown off the administration’s efforts to put bilateral relationships on a friendlier basis**. Not only is President Obama back to Bush’s old policy of trying to get the UN to adopt tougher sanctions on Iran, he’s denouncing human rights crackdowns in Cuba. The biggest success to date, getting a new missile treaty with Russia, is at lot less impressive than it looks. Russia needs to reduce the costs of its nuclear arsenal and wants the prestige that comes from arms talks with the US just like the Soviet Union used to have. I support the treaty and hope it gets ratified, but on the whole it’s more a favor from us to Russia than the other way round. In many cases, the administration has good reasons for specific choices that it makes. Russia, for example, is never going to be our best friend, but there is no point in not trying to put relations on a more businesslike basis. Britain’s stand on the Falkland Islands, that there is ‘nothing to negotiate’ where sovereignty is concerned, is a tricky one to support. It always looks bad to be against talks. Given global skepticism about US intentions after the poorly handled war in Iraq, it made sense for the Obama administration to bend over backwards to show it was willing to reach a new relationship with Iran. Pressing Karzai to clean up the abysmal corruption that wastes American money and undermines the strength of his government is certainly the right thing to do. And by twice announcing controversial housing decisions in Jerusalem during critical talks with the United States, the Israeli government was showing enough arrogance or incompetence that the White House had to do something. But while many of steps the administration is taking make sense on their own terms, when you look at them all together the picture isn’t pretty. Beating up on your friends and **kissing up to your enemies looks terrible**, especially when neither your friends nor your enemies show any respect. Slamming Honduras and pampering Russia might have both been good decisions on their own; but when you do them both you end up looking like a hypocrite who moralistically and didactically lectures the weak while fawning on the strong. **Nobody respects that kind of behavior, and nobody admires people who practice it. It tastes weak, like blood in the water — and the sharks out there are paying attention.** The emerging perception of weakness is one reason the administration has had to fight Israel so hard over the Jerusalem issue. As Laura Rozen reports in a must read article at Politico.com, administration sources say that the quarrel with Netanyahu is “bigger than Jerusalem” because “**it’s about the credibility of the administration.”** **It’s precisely because so many people have kicked so much sand in the administration’s face that it had to raise the stakes so high** on this one. **Forcing** Netanyahu to **back down** in Jerusalem **may help the administration fight the perception of weakness abroad, but it is unlikely to help** President **Obama much at home**. And **he may not get the win he seeks**. Canada and Brazil have blown the administration off with no ill effects, and even the preternaturally accommodating Japanese are still defying the administration over the unpopular American military base on Okinawa. If Netanyahu sticks to his guns on an issue where he has strong domestic support, he might still force Washington to compromise. Beating up on our few remaining friends isn’t going to fix things. **What the President really needs is a victory over an adversary. He needs to get** North Korea, Iran, Syria, Hamas, **Venezuela or** even **Cuba to take a step back** — or he needs to charm one of them into behaving more nicely. Capturing bin Laden or otherwise achieving something decisive in Afghanistan would also be a plus. **Failing that, foreign policy will be a continuing weak spot for the administration, and sooner or later that will mean trouble**.

**anything short of big stick on Venezuela triggers intense congressional opponents and high media profile**

**Harper, 10** (liz, Senior Editor @ US Institute for Peace, adjunct fellow at the Council on Hemispheric Affairs, americasquarterly.org contributing blogger based in Washington DC, 12/21, <http://americasquarterly.org/node/2058>)

I'm told that **some sought to torpedo Palmer's nomination from the get-go,** either preferring another candidate with more credentials on human rights, or **not wanting an ambassador in Venezuela at all**. **Critics doubted that Palmer**—despite his experience as President of the Inter-American Foundation and as the Chargé d’Affaires in Ecuador during a time of major internal crises—**had the steel to tangle with Venezuela**'s strongman. **To many**, his **soft tone and circumspect statements at his** confirmation **hearing reinforced this view. Because Palmer did not come out swinging a big stick** at his Senate confirmation hearing, Senator Richard **Lugar sent the ambassador a set of "questions for the record**" (QFRs), in attempt **to strengthen support** for his nomination. Palmer sat down with folks at the State Department and answered them, discussing the low morale in Venezuela's military, the ties between members of Venezuela's government and Colombian guerrillas and allowing them refuge in Venezuelan territory, its role in narcotrafficking, Chávez' increasing control over the judicial and legislative branches, steady erosion of checks and balances, and violations of human rights and freedom of the press. **Palmer's responses**—which he thought would be closely held, according to several sources at the State Department, including the ambassador-designate himself—**were newsworthy**, especially at a time of heightened tensions between Colombia and Venezuela. **The QFR ripped around town and the world, media reports picked up Palmer's statements**, thereby setting off the wildfire. **So much for** the State Department **trying to keep a "low profile" on Venezuela** and the sensitive situation in the Andean region.

**Spun as appeasement, soft on terrorism and national security**

**Kouri, 11**

Jim Kouri, Law Enforcement Examiner

Jim Kouri, CPP, the fifth Vice President and Public Information Officer of the National Association of Chiefs of Police, has served on the National Drug Task Force and trained police and security officers throughout the country, Examiner.com, 6/26/11, <http://www.examiner.com/article/obama-urged-to-place-venezuela-on-terrorist-sponsor-list>

**Obama urged to place Venezuela on "Terrorist Sponsor List**" Venezuela's President Hugo Chavez, who is believed to be in Cuba following emergency surgery, is in ''critical'' but stable condition, Miami's El Nuevo Herald has reported. The government has treated the President's departure since June 10 as a state secret. Chavez's government so far has made no comment about Iran Hezbollah activities in their country. During Friday's hearing of **the House Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, Chair**man Connie **Mack** (R-14) **again called on** the **Obama** Administration **to cease** their **delaying of placing Venezuela on the** "State Sponsor of **Terrorism List." The hearing, "Venezuela's Sanction able Activity," was held to provide oversight of sanctions available** for the State Department and Treasury Department to dissuade illicit activity in the Western Hemisphere. **To date, the Obama Administration has underutilized these tools** allowing ruthless dictator Hugo Chavez to profit from the drug trade, sell fuel to the Iranians, and transport terrorists around the world. Congressman **Mack stated, "The State Department said they would name Venezuela a state sponsor of terrorism** **as well as enforce** consequential **sanctions** on their state run oil company i**f they received proof that Venezuela is demonstrably sanctionable. That proof was again presented to officials** of the State and Treasury Departments and **further delay by the Obama Administration is unacceptable and will only continue to coddle** Hugo Chavez." Chairman **Mack reiterated Venezuela's repeated support for acts of international terrorism; including the sale of refined fuel to Iran and** the actions of Ghazi Nasr al Din, a Venezuelan Diplomat, who was sanctioned by the Treasury Department for facilitating the **transfer of funds to Hezbollah** and escorted Hezbollah officials to and from Venezuela. **Iran, and** its proxy group **Hezbollah** **continue to expand their presence** in Central and South American **taking advantage of their already close relationship with Venezuela**'s despot Presidente Hugo Chavez, **according to** Air Force General Douglas **Fraser, commanding officer of the U.S. Southern Command**, Additionally, Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) drew sanctions on several Venezuelan senior government officials, Hugo Carvajal Barrios, the Director of Military Intelligence, and Henry de Jesus Rangel Silva, General-in-Chief of the Venezuelan Armed Services, for materially assisting and supporting drug trafficking and terrorism activities by the revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC). Mack added: "If the Obama Administration continues to coddle Hugo Chavez and the threat he poses to our security, freedom loving Americans will take matters into their hands by not purchasing oil and gas from PDVSA, the Chavez run oil company which operates as CITGO in the U.S." **In addition, last week Rep**. Ileana **Ros-Lehtinen** (R-FL), **Chair**man **of the House Foreign Affairs Committee**, said that no U.S. funds should be provided to the newly-formed Hezbollah government in Lebanon, or to a Palestinian Authority that includes Hamas. The congresswoman **and other lawmakers are concerned that U.S. taxpayer money may end up in the hands of terrorist groups** claiming to be political organizations. “For years, members of Congress warned that it was unwise to fund a Lebanese government in which Hezbollah participated. **It was clear that** Hezbollah’s influence was growing, and that **the Executive Branch had no long-term strategy to deal with that reality, and no contingency plan to stop U.S. aid from falling into the wrong hands," she said**.

**Economic Engagement perceived by congressional critics as appeasement, soft on national security, terrorism and iran**

**Goodenough, 12**

Patrick Goodenough, Patrick covered government and politics in South Africa and the Middle East before joining CNSNews.com in 1999. Since then he has launched foreign bureaus for CNSNews.com in Jerusalem, London and the Pacific Rim. From October 2006 to July 2007, Patrick served as Managing Editor at the organization's world headquarters in Alexandria, Va. Now back in the Pacific Rim, as International Editor he reports on politics, international relations, security, terrorism, ethics and religion, and oversees reporting by CNSNews.com's roster of international stringers, CNS News, 2/2/12, <http://cnsnews.com/news/article/iran-venezuela-links-examined-amid-fresh-calls-terror-sponsor-designation>

**Iran-Venezuela Links Examined Amid Fresh Calls for Terror-Sponsor Designation U.S. lawmakers will turn a spotlight** Thursday **on the deepening links between Iran and leftist regimes** in Latin America, at a meeting that will likely hear fresh calls for the administration to designate Venezuela as a state sponsor of terrorism. **Three weeks after Iranian President** Mahmoud Ahmadinejad **visited Venezuela**, Cuba, Nicaragua and Ecuador, the U.S. **House Foreign Affairs Committee will hold** a **hearing entitled** “Ahmadinejad’s **Tour of Tyrants and Iran’s Agenda in the** Western **Hemisphere**.” “**Iran** has been actively working for years to expand its ties and influence in the Western Hemisphere, and it **has found willing partners in the region’s anti-American despots,” committee chair**man Rep. Ileana **Ros-Lehtinen** (R-Fla.) **said** in an earlier statement. **The panel aims to review steps the U.S. should take to advance American interests** and counter Iran’s activities in the region. Among experts scheduled to testify is Institute for Global Economic Growth president **Norman Bailey, who formerly served on the National Security Council** and in the Office of the Director of Na­tional Intelligence, where he was appointed in November 2006 as “mission manager” for Cuba and Venezuela. In a briefing paper published by the American Foreign Policy Council on Wednesday, Bailey **explored the** Hugo Chavez **regime’s “facilitation** and encouragement **of** the penetration of the Western Hemisphere by the Islamic Republic of **Iran.**” “Since 2005, **with Venezuela’s assistance, Iran has created an extensive regional network** of economic, diplomatic, industrial and commercial activities, **with significant effect**,” he wrote, noting that Iran’s interests have extended to other Latin American countries, especially the leftist-governed Ecuador, Bolivia and Nicaragua. Bailey noted that although **the Iran-Venezuela partnership had caught the attention of U.S. policymakers in recent years,** “little by way of concrete responses has emerged to counter the ex­tensive web of illicit activity and strategic connections that Iran has made in Ven­ezuela and throughout Latin America.” **Among his recommendations – designation of Venezuela as a state sponsor of terrorism, for its collusion both with Iran and** the Iranian-backed Lebanese terrorist group, **Hezbollah**. Bailey said designation would potentially result in a boycott of Venezuelan oil to the U.S., but argued that the oil shipments “could easily be made up with equivalent amounts re­leased from the U.S. Strategic Petroleum Reserve.” “By contrast, such a move would have a much more pronounced impact on the Venezuelan economy.” Links to foreign terrorist organizations The U.S. currently lists Cuba, Syria, Iran and Sudan as state sponsors of terrorism, **a designation that carries sanctions** including a ban on arms-related exports and sales, controls over exports of dual-use items, **prohibitions on economic assistance, and various financial restrictions.** Designation requires a determination by the secretary of state that a country’s government “has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism,” for example through support for and links to “foreign terrorist organizations” (FTOs).

**Congressional resolution passage proves congress perceives plan as appeasement – triggers bipartisan opposition**

**Walser, 10**

Ray Walser, Ph.D., is Senior Policy Analyst for Latin America in the Douglas and Sarah Allison Center for Foreign Policy Studies, a division of the Kathryn and Shelby Cullom Davis Institute for International Studies, at The Heritage Foundation, 1/20/10, <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2010/01/state-sponsors-of-terrorism-time-to-add-venezuela-to-the-list>

Since January 2009, the Obama Administration's attempts to improve relations with the stridently anti-America Chávez have yielded little more than empty gestures. Although ambassadorial relations were restored in June 2009, Chávez has signaled renewed support for the narcoterrorism of the FARC, begun threatening and punishing Colombia for its defense cooperation agreement with the U.S., helped destabilize Honduras by backing former president Manuel Zelaya's illegal referendum, pushed ahead with major Russian arms acquisitions, and sealed ever closer ties, including joint nuclear ventures, with Iran. Venezuela plays an increasingly prominent role as a primary transit country for cocaine flowing from Colombia to the U.S., Europe, and West Africa. Nevertheless, the **Obama** Administration, according to the President's National Security Council adviser on Latin America, Dan Restrepo, **does not consider Venezuela to be a challenge to U.S. national security:** President Obama "does not see Venezuela as a challenge to U.S. national security. There is no Cold War nor Hot War. Those things belong to the past."[2] **This view is not optimistic--it is dangerous. The Administration needs to, as a recent bipartisan congressional resolution urges, adopt a genuinely tough-minded approach to dealing with** Chávez and **Venezuela.** The Administration needs to develop a public diplomacy strategy to counter Chavista disinformation and a diplomatic strategy in the Americas that responds to growing threats of political destabilization. **It** also **needs to recognize tha**t under Chávez, **Venezuela has become terrorism's most prominent supporter in the Western Hemisphere.** The Obama Administration can begin to correct this policy of drift and inaction **by placing Venezuela on the list of state sponsors of terrorism** along with Iran.[3]

**Powerful congressional and committee backlash – spun as appeasement and soft on terror**

**O’Brien, ‘9** (Michael, The Hill, 10/28, http://thehill.com/blogs/blog-briefing-room/news/65219-lawmakers-want-venezuela-named-a-state-sponsor-of-terrorism

**Lawmakers want Venezuela named a state sponsor of terrorism** A **bipartisan** pair of **lawmakers introduced a resolution** on Wednesday **to classify Venezuela as a state sponsor of terrorism.** Rep. Ron **Klein** (D-Fla.), a member **of the Foreign Affairs committee, and** Rep. Connie **Mack** (R-Fla.), **the ranking member of the Western Hemisphere subcommittee, joined** together **to float a bill calling** on Secretary of State Hillary Clinton **to add Venezuela to the list of states which sponsor terrorism**. **The resolution,** H.Res.872, **cites the Venezuelan government's ties to Iran, Hezbollah, and the** Revolutionary Armed Forces of Columbia (**FARC)** as examples of the South American nation's support for terrorism. "The **evidence linking Venezuela**’s Hugo Chavez **to the FARC and Hezbollah** – two of the most dangerous terrorist organizations, responsible for many bombings, kidnappings, killings and drug trafficking – **is overwhelming," Mack said** in a statement announcing the resolution. "**Naming Venezuela a state sponsor of terrorism will strengthen the stability of the region," the Florida Republican, who has long been a vocal critic** of Chavez, **added. "The Administration must not turn a blind eye to** Chavez’s **dangerous aggression and must add Venezuela to the state sponsors of terrorism list** without delay.” "Venezuela’s assistance to the FARC in Colombia destabilizes the region and places the Chavez regime squarely outside the international community," Klein said. "**This legislation seeks to stop Venezuela’s facilitation of terrorism now**. The United States cannot and will not accept such actions taking place so close to home.”

**Especially because well documented terror ties – drives opposition**

**Goodenough, 12**

Patrick Goodenough, Patrick covered government and politics in South Africa and the Middle East before joining CNSNews.com in 1999. Since then he has launched foreign bureaus for CNSNews.com in Jerusalem, London and the Pacific Rim. From October 2006 to July 2007, Patrick served as Managing Editor at the organization's world headquarters in Alexandria, Va. Now back in the Pacific Rim, as International Editor he reports on politics, international relations, security, terrorism, ethics and religion, and oversees reporting by CNSNews.com's roster of international stringers, CNS News, 2/2/12, <http://cnsnews.com/news/article/iran-venezuela-links-examined-amid-fresh-calls-terror-sponsor-designation>

In its most recent annual report on international terrorism, published last August, the State Department in its section on state sponsors cites Cuba’s links with the Basque separatist group ETA and the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC) – both FTOs – as well as Iranian and Syrian sponsorship of Hezbollah and Palestinian FTOs including Hamas. Yet **Venezuela’s links to Hezbollah are well-documented (as early as** June **2008,** the U.S. **Treasury** Department **charged that** Chavez’ **government was** “employing and **providing safe harbor to Hezbollah** facilitators and fundraisers”) **and** he **has also been accused of ties to FARC and to ETA**. **Caracas’ cozy relationship** with state sponsors of terror **Cuba and Iran – including new concerns that** Chavez **could help Tehran** to **evade** the latest Western **sanctions** against its banks and oil exports – **provide further reason, proponents say, for Venezuela itself to be designated. Rep.** Connie M**ack** (R-Fla.), **chair**man **of the Foreign Affairs subcommittee** on the Western Hemisphere, **has** for several years sponsored legislation **urging action. The most recent bill**, introduced in May 2011, **calls for “Venezuela to be designated a state sponsor of terrorism for its support of Iran, Hezbollah, and** the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (**FARC**).” Mack introduced similar bills in October 2009 and in March 2008.

**Venezuela Appeasement link – Yes Spillover**

**Venezuela Engagement policies spun as appeasement – triggers intense fight and derails Obama domestic agenda priorities**

**Dueck, 11**

Colin Dueck,professor at the Department of Public and International Affairs, George Mason University, October 1, 2011

policy review » no. 169, <http://www.hoover.org/publications/policy-review/article/94006>

Look at how **Obama’s strategy of accommodation has played out in relation to** four categories of foreign governments: 1) those essentially hostile to the United States, 2) those who pursue a mixture of strategic rivalry and cooperation, 3) genuine American allies, and 4) Arab governments of varying allegiance. The first category, of **regimes** basically **hostile to the U**nited **S**tates**, includes** the governments of Iran, North Korea, **Cuba, and Venezuela, to name** only four of **the most notable**. Each of **these governments has literally defined itself at a fundamental level by violent opposition to America**. To think that a conciliatory tone, a preliminary concession, or a well-intentioned desire for better relations on the part of a U.S. president by itself will transform that hostility is simply naïve. In the case of Cuba, for example, the Obama administration began by lifting certain economic sanctions, in the hope of seeing some reciprocal concessions from the Castro brothers: political liberalization, an easing of anti-American hostility, anything at all of significance. No such concessions have been made. The case of Iran has already been discussed — Obama reached out to Tehran with great fanfare in 2009, and has received in effect a slap in the face. Both Venezuela’s Hugo Chavez and North Korea’s Kim Jong Il are likewise just as hostile and provocative toward the United States today as they were when George W. Bush was America’s president. This is because the fundamental barrier to friendly U.S. relations with those regimes was never George W. Bush. The fundamental barrier to friendly relations with these regimes is the fact that they are bitterly hostile to the United States. The kinds of **concessions** that Washington would have to offer to win their genuine **accommodation would be** so sweeping, massive, and **unacceptable, from the point of view of any likely U.S. president that they will not be made — and certainly not by** Barack **Obama**. Any smaller concessions from Washington, therefore, are simply pocketed by a hostile regime, which continues along in its basic antipathy toward the United States. So who is supposed to be the target audience here? The true audience and for that matter the ultimate source of these various conciliatory policy initiatives is essentially a small, transnational, North Atlantic class of bien pensant opinion who already share Obama’s core policy priorities in any case. They have rewarded him with their support, as well as with the Nobel Peace Prize. Others internationally are less impressed. And in the meantime, we may have lost something, in terms of the ability to seriously prepare for certain looming security challenges. A primary and continuing emphasis on diplomatic engagement after Iran has repeatedly rebuffed the United States does not help us to prepare for the possibility of a nuclear-armed Iran. A declared commitment to nuclear abolition does nothing to convince other nuclear powers to abandon their own arsenals, and may even be counterproductive in the sense that it deludes important segments of opinion into believing that such declarations actually help to keep the peace. Obama has said from the beginning that the purpose of his more conciliatory foreign policy approach was to bolster American standing in the world, but the definition of international standing has actually been highly self-referential in the direction of aforementioned transatlantic liberal opinion. In many cases overseas, from the perspective of other governments, Obama’s well-intentioned **conciliatory gestures are read as a sign of weakness**, and consequently undermine rather than bolster American standing. In one way, however, **Obama** has already achieved much of what he desired with his **strategy** of accommodation, and that **is to re-orient American** national resources and **attention away from national security concerns and toward** the expansion of **domestic progressive reforms**. He appears to sincerely believe that these liberal domestic initiatives in areas such as health care and finance will also bolster American economic power and competiveness. Actually they will do no such thing, since heavy-handed and constantly changing federal regulations tend to undermine investor confidence as well as long-term U.S. economic growth. But either way, **Obama’s vision of** a more expansive government role in **American society is well on its way to being achieved, without** from his point of view **debilitating debates over major national security concerns**. **In that sense,** especially **if he is reelected** in 2012, several of his **major strategic priorities will have been accomplished**. Any **good strategy must incorporate the possibility of pushback or resistance** from unexpected quarters. As they say in the U.S. military, the enemy gets a vote. So, for that matter, do other countries, whether friendly or not. When things do not go exactly according to plan, any decent strategy and any capable leader adapt. Indeed any decent foreign policy strategy begins with the recognition for backup plans, since inevitably things will not go exactly according to plan. Other countries rarely respond to our initial strategic moves in precisely the way we might wish. The question then becomes: What is plan B? **Obama is tactically very flexible**, but at the level of grand strategy he seems to have no backup plan. There is simply no recognition of the possibility that world politics might not operate on the post-Vietnam liberal assumptions he has imbibed and represented over the years. Obama’s critics often describe him as providing no strong foreign policy leadership. They underestimate him. Actually he has a very definite idea of where he wants to take the United States. **His guiding foreign policy idea is** that of **international accommodation**, sparked by American example. He pursues that overarching concept with great tactical pliability but without any sign of ideological or basic revision since coming into office. Yet empirically, in one case after another, the strategy is not working. This is a kind of leadership, to be sure, but leadership in the wrong direction. **Obama believes that liberal domestic initiatives will bolster American economic power and competitiveness.** How can the Obama administration adapt and adjust to the failures of its strategy of accommodation? It can admit that the attempted diplomatic engagement of Iran has failed, and shift toward a strategy of comprehensive pressure against that regime. It can make it abundantly clear to both the Taliban and al Qaeda that the United States will not walk away from Afghanistan, despite the beginning drawdown. It can start treating Russia as a geopolitical rival, which it is, rather than simply as a diplomatic partner. It can strengthen U.S. missile defenses as a form of insurance against nuclear proliferators. There is a long list of policy recommendations that can be made on specific regional and functional matters, but the prior and most important point is the need for a change in mentality. President Obama needs to stop working on the assumption that U.S. foreign policy concessions or gestures directed at the gallery of elite transatlantic opinion — whether on nuclear arms control, counterterrorism, or climate change — will somehow be reciprocated by specific foreign governments in the absence of some very hard bargaining. He needs to grasp that U.S. strategic disengagement from specific regional theaters, whether promised or underway, is taken as a sign of weakness in those regions and not simply as a sign of benevolent restraint. He needs to recognize that America’s international reputation consists not only of working toward his own definition of the moral high ground, but also very much of a reputation for strength, and specifically of a reputation for the willingness to use force. He needs to stop operating on the premise that past American foreign policy decisions are the ultimate source of much violent discord in the world today. He needs to be willing to divide the international system conceptually and operationally into friends and enemies, as they actually exist, and to support America’s friends while pressuring and opposing its enemies relentlessly. Finally, he needs to admit the limited effect of his own personal charisma on the foreign policies of other governments. The president of the United States is not an international community organizer. If the conceptual framework that underpins Obama’s foreign policy strategy is altered, then better policies will flow on a wide range of specific issues. Obama needs to be willing to support America’s friends while pressuring and opposing its enemies relentlessly. Admittedly, there is little chance that Obama will concede any of this. One of the things we know from historical example is that presidents tend to keep operating on their own inbuilt foreign policy assumptions, even as contrary evidence piles up. It usually takes either a dramatic external shock, or a new administration altogether, to bring about a major revaluation of existing assumptions. Curiously, this resistance to contrary evidence in foreign policy appears to be even truer of highly educated, self-confident, and intelligent people with core ideological convictions — a description that certainly fits President Obama. **Obama is malleable on tactics**, and he takes great care to project an aura of sensible calm, but in truth **he is** a conviction **president powered by** certain core ideological beliefs and **vaulting policy ambitions**. His characteristic response when these core beliefs and ambitions are truly tested by opponents or events is not to bend, but to bristle. He is therefore particularly unlikely to admit or even perceive that a foreign policy strategy based upon faulty assumptions of international accommodation is failing or has failed. Nor is it politically convenient for him to do so. More likely, he will continue along his chosen path, offering nothing more than tactical adjustments, until some truly dramatic event occurs which brings his whole foreign policy strategy into question — an Iranian nuclear test, for example.

**Ext – Appeasement lx – A2 Assumes Chavez**

**Chavez’s successor only magnifies the controversy**

**Washington Post 13** (03/06, “A misguided U.S. strategy for Venezuela,” http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2013-03-06/opinions/37497866\_1\_nicolas-maduro-apartments-and-appliances-henrique-capriles)

**ANTICIPATING THE death of Hugo Chavez, the Obama administration began reaching out months ago to his designated successor, Nicolas Maduro, in the hope of bettering U.S.-Venezuelan relations. On Tuesday, that strategy absorbed a body blow: Hours before revealing that Mr. Chavez had died of cancer, Mr. Maduro tried to blame the United States for his illness, and he expelled two U.S. military attaches on charges of “proposing destabilizing plans” to the armed forces. So much for the “reset” with Caracas. The ludicrous and crude propaganda launched by Mr. Maduro was a sign that Mr. Chavez’s successors will be more thuggish and less politically adept than he was — and, if anything, more inclined to scapegoat the United States and Venezuela’s democratic opposition for the horrendous problems the caudillo leaves behind.**

**Nothing Changed – Maduro pursuing “all out Chavismo”**

**Alic, 13**

Jen Alic of Oilprice.com, 4/21/13, <http://www.mining.com/web/foreign-oil-and-gas-companies-look-to-status-quo-in-venezuela/>

Foreign oil and gas companies look to status quo in Venezuela **Now that** Nicolas **Maduro**—the late Hugo **Chavez’s choice for successor**—has narrowly **won** Sunday’s presidential **elections in Venezuela,** oil and gas **investors can expect a perpetuation of the status quo**. In Sunday’s voVte, **Maduro won with** a very narrow 50.7% and **a vow to continue with Chavez’s “revolution,” which has seen** the oil **industry nationalized and** the state-run PDVSA oil company funding social programs and **voraciously courting China and Russia.** The narrow vote will not be without its challenges. Opposition rival candidate Henrique Capriles has refused to recognize the results and is demanding a recount, though the electoral commission is standing firm on Maduro’s victory. For foreign oil and gas companies, **we can expect more of the same. There are no regulatory changes in the works,** and an unattractive windfall tax system announced in January will likely be pushed forward under Maduro. What Maduro is inheriting, though, is a nightmare situation that will see him stuck between using PDVSA to fund expensive social programs that cost it $44 billion last year alone diverted from oil revenues, and cutting social spending or allowing a rise in the price of fuel that could spark regime-threatening unrest. If Maduro feels compelled to reduce fuel subsidies, it could lead to riots as cheap fuel—which cannot be sustained—is one of the most crucial social benefits for Venezuelans, who pay around 6 cents per gallon. **Maduro** has inherited a “sinking ship” and **does not appear to have the political capital to make any short-term changes** in Venezuela’s energy policy, **experts** at Southern Pulse **told** Oilprice.com. “The main energy issue for Venezuela is that oil production is struggling, down from a peak of about 3.2 million barrels per day in 1998 to less than 2.8 million bpd now. One would hope that fixing infrastructure, completing refinery repairs and construction, and investing in exploration and new technology would be priorities but Maduro will not have funds to invest unless he makes controversial cuts to social programs,” according to Southern Pulse, which does not believe that Maduro will attempt to cut fuel subsidies any time soon. A top priority for Maduro will be boosting refining capacity, says Southern Pulse. Towards this end, Maduro may be willing to negotiate if a partner steps forward to build a new refinery, which is a goal Chavez failed to realize. “If PDVSA fails to increase production, PDVSA President Rafael Ramirez may be replaced this year. One way for Maduro to keep his presidency afloat is to bring new proven wells online in the Orinoco Belt; but that will require major investment. PDVSA may need more than a minority-partner-with-a-service-contract at those fields if they want to start pumping soon.” In the meantime, China’s foothold in Venezuela remains on solid ground. China is already privy to 600,000 bpd from Venezuela in return for $42 billion in loans. Maduro is not likely to rock this boat with Beijing, and according to the terms already in place, Venezuelan exports are set to increase to one million bpd by 2015, though most of the loan money has already been spent. According to Southern Pulse, Maduro will likely seek new loans from China, but this will depend on the terms and stability in Venezuela. If this doesn’t work, Maduro will have to look elsewhere—first to Russia and then perhaps to US Chevron or Spanish Repsol, the latter two having only limited operations in the country. **Overall, we should consider that Maduro will pursue all-out chavismo. “As president, Maduro will govern as he thinks Chavez himself would have ruled.** However, Maduro probably will not begin pandering to the most radical elements of his party, PSUV, because he has little to gain from that. Maduro is not blind to the myriad problems facing the next president such as blackouts, food shortages and rampant criminal violence,” according to Southern Pulse. While **it’s status quo for now** for the oil and gas industry, it’s clearly bad news for Maduro. “Despite Chavez’s immense popularity, his memory will fade. And with time citizens who loved Chavez will blame Maduro for their struggles,” experts at Southern Pulse say. “If Maduro survives that long, the next election in 2018 will involve a much deeper conversation about the direction of the country.” “In fact, some think that one reason former military leader and current National Assembly Diosdado Cabello—a Chavez loyalist–did not dispute Maduro’s succession is precisely because of the precarious financial and political situation he would have inherited.”

**Chavez death changes nothing**

**Goodman, 13** (Josh, Bloomberg reporter responsible for economic and political coverage in Latin America, 4/17,

http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-04-17/venezuelan-leader-s-taunts-won-t-provoke-u-s-diplomat-says-2-.html

The U.S. is unlikely to adopt a more confrontational stance toward Venezuela even as President- elect Nicolas **Maduro ratchets up his rhetoric** in the wake of his narrow victory, the State Department’s top official for Latin America said. Echoing charges frequently levied by his political mentor, the late President Hugo Chavez, Maduro yesterday accused the U.S. of trying to oust him by supporting opposition calls for a recount of ballots in the April 14 election he won by about 270,000 votes. Today, **he likened** President Barack **Obama’s policy towards Venezuela to U.S. support for the overthrow of Chile’s** Salvador **Allende** in 1973. Roberta Jacobson, assistant secretary of state for Western Hemisphere affairs, said **such rhetoric has become more commonplace since Maduro took control of Venezuela’s** troubled **economy** following Chavez’s death from cancer last month. While **that makes it harder for relations to improve**, the U.S. is unlikely to respond in kind, she said. **“I don’t think there’s going to be a marked difference in the way we respond to Maduro versus the way we responded to Chavez,” Jacobson**, a career diplomat, **said** in an interview from the State Department in Washington. “It still doesn’t make sense to get in, you’ll excuse me, a pissing match with Nicolas Maduro any more than it did with Chavez.” While relations between the U.S. and Venezuela have long been strained -- the two countries have gone without ambassadors since 2010 -- former president George W. Bush in his second term adopted a more conciliatory tone toward Chavez, which Obama continued. Other Cheek At the heart of what Jacobson called a “turning of the cheek” approach are strong commercial ties -- Venezuela was the U.S.’s fourth-biggest supplier of oil last year -- and a sense of political realism. That means that while the U.S. won’t back away from expressing its disappointment with the fairness of the election and the lack of a recount, that shouldn’t lead relations to deteriorate further, she said. While Russia, China and most of Latin America has congratulated Maduro for his win, the U.S. and European Union have held back support while seeking a recount to address opposition claims of irregularities. “**If** Friday **Maduro is** sworn in as **president, I don’t think that’s going to change very much from one day to the next our positions,**” **said Jacobson, who has served as the U.S.’s top diplomat to Latin America** since 2011. ‘Rush to Judgment’ Jacobson said the U.S. will continue to believe that the way the election results were handled represent a “rush to judgment” that won’t help Venezuela overcome deep political divisions. Still, **Jacobson** said she **doesn’t harbor much hope that relations will improve** either, **even after** what she described as **Maduro’s favorable response to a U.S. outreach** a few months ago. In November, Jacobson said she called then-Foreign Minister Maduro to discuss how to get relations back on track in a likely post-Chavez government. High-level meetings between the two governments were also held, though they lost momentum as Chavez’s worsening health came to dominate the nation’s affairs, she said. Then, in the hours before Chavez’s death, **Maduro suggested the U.S. may have poisoned the socialist leader.** **During the** month-long campai**gn he continued to ramp up “exponentially” his anti-American rhetoric, “making it much harder”** today **to find any common ground**, Jacobson said. Long Harangue Jacobson’s first **encounter with Maduro**, at the April 2012 Summit of the Americas in Colombia**, was** also **marked by confrontation**. In a private negotiating session attended by foreign ministers, she said she was subjected to a “long, long harangue” by Maduro, in which he accused the U.S. of imperialism and starving communist Cuba with its half-century trade embargo. “There were many around that table who were acutely uncomfortable with him yelling -- and he was yelling at this point -- at a woman across the table,” she said. “Closing the doors didn’t seem to make a difference.” Then, less than two months later, at a meeting of the Organization of American States in Bolivia, the two traded pleasantries while posing side-by-side for a group photo. Maduro said he held no grudges against her or the U.S., according to Jacobson. “It’s very hard to read these signals,” she said. “**Every time we get to the point of actually working on substantive stuff, we end up taking steps backward with accusations** of everything from killing Chavez with cancer to coups.”

**Ext - Appeasement link - A2: supports business not regime**

**Plan can’t avoid accusations of supporting the regime – business and investment is coopted**

**Toro, 13**

Fransisco Toro, Venezuelan journalist, political scientist, reported for the Washington Post, the New York Times and the Financial Times, and was Editor of VenEconomy, Venezuela's leading bilingual business magazine. Since 2002, he has run Caracas Chronicles, the must-read English-language blog on all things Venezuelan He holds a BA from Reed College (1997), and MSc from the London School of Economics (1999) and is currently a doctoral candidate in Political Science at the University of Maastricht, in The Netherlands. New Republic, 3/5/13, [http://www.newrepublic.com/article/112596/hugo-chavez-dead-cuba-defined-him-much-venezuela-did#](http://www.newrepublic.com/article/112596/hugo-chavez-dead-cuba-defined-him-much-venezuela-did)

**Chávez imported** more than just personnel and advice; he imported **the Cuban Revolution's** eschatology **virtually whole.** Fidel's vision of revolution as a kind of cosmic morality play pitting unalloyed socialist "good" in an unending death struggle against the ravages of "**evil" American imperialism became the guiding principle of Venezuela's revolution.** The use and abuse of anti-imperialist rhetoric as a mechanism for consolidating authoritarian control over society was the most valuable lesson Chávez learned from Fidel. A superheated brand of unthinking anti-Americanism became the all-purpose excuse for any and every authoritarian excess, stigmatizing any form of protests and casting a dark pall over any expression of discontent or dissent. The technique's infinite versatility proved its central attraction: You could blame shadowy gringo infiltrator for neighborhood protests over chronic power shortages just as easily as you could silence whistleblowers of government corruption by casting them as CIA fifth columns. In Cuba, considering the island's history as a target for American imperialist meddling, anti-imperialism—however wantonly abused—rested on a bed of historic verisimilitude. But in Venezuela, a country with no history of direct American imperial aggression, this borrowed bit of rhetorical posturing served only to underline chavismo's derivative status, its ideology a kind of fidelista hand-me-down lacking even the self-awareness to realize it was decades out of date by the time it was born. Where Chávez was able to transcend the Cuban model, it was largely due to the advantages of life at the receiving end of an unprecedented petrodollar flood. By some estimates, **Venezuela** sold over $1 trillion worth of oil during his tenure, and so his was government by hyperconsumption, not rationing. The petroboom allowed Chávez to **substitute the checkbook for the gulag**; marginalizing his opponents via popular spending programs rather than rounding them up and throwing them in jail. **Rather than declaring all out-war on business, he co-opted them. Rather than abolish civil society, he created a parallel civil society**, complete with pro-government unions, universities, radio stations and community councils. **Such enhancements were tried before** by left-wing populists in Latin America, **but always** failed because they **ran out of money**. **Chávez avoided this pitfall thanks to the greatest of his innovations: He consciously avoided a complete break with the U.S.** that Castro provoked in 1960. **Instead, he railed against gringo imperialism all morning, then spent all afternoon selling those same gringos oil.** The irony is that this, his most important innovation, will be the one least memorialized by his admirers. It was a gloriously incoherent posture, but one that fit the square peg of revolutionary zeal into the round hole of an import-led petropopulism. Ironically, though, in its dependence on oil rents, the Chávez model quietly undermined its own claim to represent a new alternative to dreaded Washington-sponsored neoliberalism. After all, if **Venezuela could afford to botch the nationalization of its own** steel **industry, it was because there were always** petro**dollars around to import** the steel that local industry was no longer producing. And **if nationalizations up and down the** agro-food **chain resulted in** food **shortages, money could always be found to import the balance. As the Venezuelan State-Owned Enterprise sector grew, it looked more and more like the USSR's**—**with** a single **profit-generating industry cross-subsidizing a bewildering array of** loss-making **concerns.** Chavenomics, as a development model, boiled down to little beyond extracting oil, selling it at high prices, and **using the proceeds to paper over the rest of the system's cracks**. How such a model is supposed to be relevant to countries that don't happen to float on top of hundreds of billions of barrels in oil reserves is anybody's guess. Still and all, petropopulism's attractions were all too clear for Chávez. Those **deep,** oil-lined **pockets allowed** Chávez **a luxury Fidel could only dream of: being able to hold a long string of not-overtly-rigged elections without ever seriously endangering** his **grip on power**. It used to be that you could have either unchecked personal power or electoral legitimacy, **but the petrodollar flood allowed Chávez to have both**. Elected autocracy may sound like an oxymoron, but this is exactly what the Venezuelan synthesis of the Cuban experience yielded: a system that washed away the sins of its own aggressive contempt for dissidence and dissent through continual recourse to the ballot box. **What** Hugo **Chávez built was, in other words, a flawless autocracy.**

**Even if its not targeted at government – congressional Critics perceive Economic engagement and industry profits as appeasement that bolsters regime – not people**

**Goodenough, 12**

Patrick Goodenough, Patrick covered government and politics in South Africa and the Middle East before joining CNSNews.com in 1999. Since then he has launched foreign bureaus for CNSNews.com in Jerusalem, London and the Pacific Rim. From October 2006 to July 2007, Patrick served as Managing Editor at the organization's world headquarters in Alexandria, Va. Now back in the Pacific Rim, as International Editor he reports on politics, international relations, security, terrorism, ethics and religion, and oversees reporting by CNSNews.com's roster of international stringers, CNS News, 2/2/12, <http://cnsnews.com/news/article/iran-venezuela-links-examined-amid-fresh-calls-terror-sponsor-designation>

Links to foreign terrorist organizations The U.S. currently lists Cuba, Syria, Iran and Sudan as state **sponsors of terrorism**, a **designation** that **carries sanctions** including a ban on arms-related exports and sales, controls over exports of dual-use items, **prohibitions on economic assistance, and various financial restrictions.** Designation requires a determination by the secretary of state that a country’s government “has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism,” for example through support for and links to “foreign terrorist organizations” (FTOs). In its most recent annual report on international terrorism, published last August, the State Department in its section on state sponsors cites Cuba’s links with the Basque separatist group ETA and the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC) – both FTOs – as well as Iranian and Syrian sponsorship of Hezbollah and Palestinian FTOs including Hamas. Yet Venezuela’s links to Hezbollah are well-documented (as early as June 2008, the U.S. Treasury Department charged that Chavez’ government was “employing and providing safe harbor to Hezbollah facilitators and fundraisers”) and he has also been accused of ties to FARC and to ETA. Caracas’ cozy relationship with state sponsors of terror Cuba and Iran – including new concerns that Chavez could help Tehran to evade the latest Western sanctions against its banks and oil exports – provide further reason, proponents say, for Venezuela itself to be designated. Rep. Connie Mack (R-Fla.), chairman of the Foreign Affairs subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, has for several years sponsored legislation urging action. **The most recent bill**, introduced in May 2011, **calls for “Venezuela to be designated a state sponsor of terrorism** for its support of Iran, Hezbollah, and the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC).” Mack introduced similar bills in October 2009 and in March 2008. In a white paper on the subject last summer, **Mack argued that** terror-sponsor **designation was not aimed at harming Venezuela’s people but to pressure** Chavez’ **government** to end support for terrorism. **“Each** SST [**state sponsor of terrorism] is treated with a unique set of sanctions**, and the designation does not prevent travel to and from Venezuela, stop legal remittances to Venezuelan families, or impact services at the US embassy.” Mack said designation could target Venezuela’s oil exports, affecting more than 33 percent of the government’s revenues. “Venezuelan oil **profits have not benefited the Venezuelan people for years**: crime is out of control, social infrastructure is destroyed, and health and education are ruined,” the paper said. “Oil in Venezuela is **used as a weapon against the people and against** other, **friendly countries in the region**.”

**Ext - Cuba lobby lx (A2: Assumes Chavez)**

**Venezuala and Cuba policies inherently tied – even after chavez**

**Toro, 13**

Fransisco Toro, Venezuelan journalist, political scientist, reported for the Washington Post, the New York Times and the Financial Times, and was Editor of VenEconomy, Venezuela's leading bilingual business magazine. Since 2002, he has run Caracas Chronicles, the must-read English-language blog on all things Venezuelan He holds a BA from Reed College (1997), and MSc from the London School of Economics (1999) and is currently a doctoral candidate in Political Science at the University of Maastricht, in The Netherlands. New Republic, 3/5/13, [http://www.newrepublic.com/article/112596/hugo-chavez-dead-cuba-defined-him-much-venezuela-did#](http://www.newrepublic.com/article/112596/hugo-chavez-dead-cuba-defined-him-much-venezuela-did)

What Fidel Taught Hugo Cuba defined Chávez's career as much as Venezuela did Hugo Chávez died today in Venezuela at the age of 58, but his battle with a never-specified form of cancer was waged largely in a Cuban hospital—a telling detail, as Cuba loomed just as large in his political imagination as his native country. It's a point that my gringo friends up north always struggle with. The Cuban Revolution's immense influence on the region has been constantly underestimated and misunderstood from day one. It's only a slight exaggeration to suggest that everything of note that's happened south of the Rio Grande since 1959 has been an attempt either to emulate, prevent, or transcend the Cuban experience. Chávez will be remembered as the most successful of Fidel Castro's emulators, the man who breathed new life into the old revolutionary dream. Starting in the 1960s, guerrilla movements throughout the hemisphere tried to replicate the Sierra Maestra rebels' road to power, to no avail. In the '70s, Chile's Salvador Allende tried the electoral route, but he didn't have a clear majority. In the '80s, Nicaragua's Sandinistas had the majority and rode it to power, but took over a state too bankrupt to implement the social reforms they'd always championed. Chávez had all three—power, votes, and money—plus charisma to boot. His was the last, best shot at reinventing Caribbean Communism for the 21st century. At the root of **the extraordinarily close alliance** Chávez **built with Cuba was a deep, paternal bond** between two men. A fiercely independent figure, the messianic Chávez was never seen to kowtow to anyone. But there were special rules for Fidel. Chávez's extraordinary devotion sprung from Castro's status as the mythical Hero-Founder of Latin America's post-war hard left. Chávez loved to brag of his frequent, spur-of-the-moment trips to Havana to seek Castro counsel. When he was diagnosed with the cancer that ultimately killed him, Chavez got invites from high-tech medical centers in Brazil and in Spain, but it was never in doubt where he would seek treatment. Chávez trusted Fidel, literally, with his life. There's no comparable relationship between two leaders in contemporary world politics, and it had its political consequences—especially for Chávez. In a Cold War throwback, **his government welcomed tens of thousands of Cuban** doctors, trainers, and "advisors"—including, por supuesto, an unknowable number of spies—**to Venezuela**. **And tens of billions of petrodollars flowed in the opposite direction, a resource stream that propped up** the last bastion of **totalitarianism in the Western Hemisphere** long past its sell-by date. For Fidel, who had had his eyes on Venezuela's oil riches since the 1960s, Chávez's election was an unbelievable stroke of luck. Much has been written about the way Venezuela stepped in to fill the fiscal and strategic void the collapse of the Soviet Union left in Cuba, but the reality is much stranger than that. As the unquestionably senior member of their Cold War alliance, the Soviets treated Cuba as just another satellite state; Fidel's subjugation to a cold war superpower was always something of an embarrassment to him. **In the Caracas-Havana axis**, by contrast, **the paymaster doubled up as the vassal.** **Venezuela** effectively **wrote a fat petrocheck month after month for the privilege of being tutelaged** by a poorer, weaker foreign power. The extent of this reverse colonization was startling. **Cuban flags** eventually **came to flutter above Venezuelan military bases and** Venezuelans witnessed the surreal spectacle of **a** democratically **elected president telling them that Venezuela and Cuba share "a single government" and that Venezuela "has two presidents**." **Cuban military advisors kept watch over Venezuela's** entire **security apparatus**, and had exclusive control over Chávez's personal security detail. Through most of his 20-month battle with cancer, **the Castros** had better information about the president's condition than even his inner circle back home, and they **maneuvered successfully to ensure a pro-Havana diehard,** Nicolás **Maduro, won the tough battle for succession.**

**Economic support for venezuala is key factor in Cuba policy – Maduro changes nothing**

**Ponce, 13**

Dr. Carlos Ponce, general coordinator of the Latin American and Caribbean Network for Democracy, co-editor of the political magazine “Nueva Politica”, lecturer in several U.S. and Latin American Universities and member of the Steering Committee of the World Movement for Democracy and the ISC of the Community of Democracies, 1/12/13, <http://www.capitolhillcubans.com/2013/01/venezuelas-coup-made-in-cuba.html>

Hugo **Chávez** was aware of the potential complications of this new surgery and he **clearly said** that in case he became unable to take oath on January 10th, or in case of his death, **his chosen one** to run **for president was** Nicolás **Maduro.** And the Constitution in Venezuela is clear: the mandate began on January 10th, 2007 and ends January 10th, 2013, and if the elected president can’t take the oath that day the Assembly’s President assumes power temporarily and calls for new elections within a maximum of 30 days. But for **Cuba**, which **receives more than $10 billion a year plus other benefits from Venezuela**, this is not acceptable**. Fidel and Raúl Castro have been close friends and supporters of Chávez's regime for economic reasons. Thanks to** Hugo **Chávez** and his fake revolution, **the Cuban dictatorial regime has been able to survive this past decade. For Castro’s regime, the future of Chávez will also mark Cuba’s future**. **The Castro brothers have become the conciliators and advisors of the two most powerful acolytes of Chávez as well as** of some fractions from **the military**. **Castro has been coordinating the meetings among** Diosdado Cabello, the **president of** **Venezuelan National Assembly**, Vice President **Maduro, Chávez’s family and** some sectors of **the military.**

**Ext – Israel Lobby Link**

**Triggers Israel lobby and congressional backlash to economic involvement in venezuela**

**Cole, 12**

Juan, Richard P. Mitchell Professor of History and the director of the Center for South Asian Studies at the University of Michigan, 1/11, <http://www.guernicamag.com/daily/juan_cole_ahmadinejad_in_latin/>

**Iranian** President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad has begun a four-nation **tour in Latin America** that **will include** Nicaragua, **Cuba, Venezuela** and Ecuador. In part, the trip is for propaganda purposes. With the European Union joining in an Israeli-inspired U.S. boycott of Iran’s Central Bank, which in essence translates into a boycott of buying Iranian petroleum, Tehran is desperate to underline that it still has friends in the world. Most of these are in Asia, but **Latin America** still does have **regimes** that will **defy** the **U.S. attempt to isolate Iran**. In one sense, these are not important countries geopolitically or economically. But **an embargo strategy** of the sort that **the U.S. is pursuing depends heavily on there being no significant leaks**. **Venezuela has** $4 billion worth of **joint projects with Iran**. (This article stresses a military dimension, with Revolutionary guards posted to the Iranian embassy in Caracas and a comparison to Soviet policies in Latin America, which led to the Cuban missile crisis. I see these Iranian moves more as an aid to espionage than being military in character.) **Venezuela is also significant because** in 2009 **it established a joint bank with Iran, which allows Iranian financial institutions to interface with other banks** via Caracas. Some in **the Israel lobbies in the U.S. Congress have urged financial sanctions on Venezuela** in order to close this loophole. But that step would make it difficult for the U.S. to pay for Venezuelan petroleum, a significant source of America’s oil imports. As it is, the U.S. Government won’t accept contracts from the Venezuela state petroleum company because the latter helps Iran with gasoline production. I doubt the U.S. government itself did much business with the company so it sounds to me like another symbolic sanction. I doubt Brasilia much likes the idea of a U.S.-Europe financial and energy boycott of a country of the global South. T**he U.S. just expelled the Venezuelan consul** in Miami over a Univision investigative report **alleging a Cuban-Venezuelan-Iranian plot** to hack U.S. nuclear facilities. (Note to the Cuba and Israel lobbies: This story is not very plausible and you wouldn’t want one of its members to be in the U.S.—hackers can be anywhere and like anonymity.)

**Jew Hating is explicit Venezuela policy – sparks lobby demands for isolation**

**Samuels, 10**

Shimon Samuels is Director for International Relations of the Simon Wiesenthal Centre, which holds consultative status at the Organisation of American States and the Latin American Parliament, 3/25/10, <http://www.thejc.com/news/world-news/29926/analysis-in-venezuela-antisemitism-state-policy>

**A new report** by the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR) **has criticised the Venezuelan government for encroaching on** the **civil and political rights** of its people, and **particularly** those **of its Jewish community.** The report **expressed** particular **concern about** the **rising** number of **antisemitic incidents, and noted that the government-controlled media "contributed to** creating an atmosphere of **intimidation and violence against the Jewish community in Venezuela". This is cause for serious alarm**. However, **it is hardly surprising**. Since Hugo Chavez took power, **antisemitic expression has grown exponentially: in government media**; in the dissemination of the Protocols of Zion; in the accusation that "Semitic banks" are sabotaging the economy; in the fact that the Caracas Jewish school was raided twice by armed forces "searching for Mossad-supplied arms caches"; in the desecration of two synagogues; and in the closing of the Israeli Embassy. The Venezuelan ambassador to Moscow even alleged that Jewish citizens implicated in a 2002 anti-Chavez coup were "Mossad agents". The origins of Mr Chavez's attitude can be traced to the influence wielded over him by his Argentine, pro-Nazi, Holocaust-denying school companion, the late Norberto Ceresole, who - in his 1998 book on Mr Chavez's election victory - warned of the Venezuelan "Jewish mafia". In a 2004 Christmas Eve message, Mr Chavez claimed that "the descendants of those who crucified Christ, the descendants of those who expelled Bolivar and crucified him in their own way… took possession of the riches of the world. A minority appropriated the world's gold, the silver, the minerals, the water, the good lands, the oil and has concentrated the riches in a few hands…" Here he was mixing the motifs of the Jews as Christ-killers and of Marxism. The next year, Mr Chavez compared the Spanish conquest of the Indians to the situation of the Palestinians and, a year after that, tolerated the appearance of "Hizbollah Venezuela", an indigenous Wayuu Indian tribe that has embraced Shiah Islam and is essentially a jihadi transplant into the region. **Much, too, has been made of the burgeoning Venezuela-Iran strategic alliance. This is primarily anti-American, but its antisemitic/anti-Zionist quotient is an added binding factor.** A weekly Caracas-Tehran flight was inaugurated in November 2004 by Mr Chavez, who arrived in Iran at the very moment his Special Forces raided the Caracas Jewish School. Mr Chavez is undoubtedly obsessed with a world Jewish conspiracy represented by the less than 12,000 **Jews** remaining in Venezuela. They **are becoming the scapegoat** for his dysfunctional administration and the economic crisis that is engulfing a country blessed with oil, coffee and sugar. **One third of the Jewish community has fled, fearing** Soviet-style **state antisemitism**. Indeed**, such a policy has all the appearances of having already begun.** A pro-Chavez television show named Venezuelan Jewish leaders as anti-Venezuelan conspirators, and called on other Jews "not involved in the conspiracy" to publicly denounce their coreligionists. A Chavista newspaper editorial questioned whether "we will have to expel them from our country… as other nations have done." The Wiesenthal Centre's 2009 appeal to the Organisation of American States to conduct an enquiry into Venezuelan government–inspired antisemitism has resulted in its associated Inter-American Commission on Human Rights Report. **Within this catalogue of Caracas's violations of fundamental rights, it unambiguously documents the government's incitement to Jew-hatred as a policy of state**. For **as long as this** autocratic **regime strategically endangers the Western hemisphere and targets the classic scapegoat,** **pro-democracy activists will surely lobby for its isolation** from the international community.

**Links – Energy/Oil Mechanisms**

**A2: Oil Lobby - General**

**Oil Lobby power exaggerated**

**Mearsheimer and Walt, ‘7**

John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt, Israel Lobby and Foreign Policy, p. 143, http://www.thirdworldtraveler.com/Israel/US\_Israel\_Lobby\_2\_ILUSFP.html

**If** Arab petrodollars or **energy companies were driving American policy, one would expect to see the U**nited **S**tates **distancing itself from Israel** and working overtime to get the Palestinians a state of their own. **Countries like Saudi Arabia have repeatedly pressed Washington to adopt a more evenhanded position toward the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, but to little avail,** and even wielding **the "oil weapon**" during the 1973 October War had little effect on U.S. support for Israel or **on** overall **American policy** in the region. **Similarly, if oil companies were driving U.S. policy, one would also have expected Washington to curry favor with big oil producers like** Saddam **Hussein's Iraq**, Muammar Gaddafi's **Libya, or** the Islamic Republic of **Iran,** **so that U.S. companies could make money helping them develop their energy resources** and bringing them to market. **Instead, the U**nited **S**tates **imposed sanctions on all three of these countries, in sharp opposition to what the oil industry wanted: Indeed in some cases the U.S. government deliberately intervened to thwart business deals that would have benefited U.S. companies. If the oil lobby were as powerful as some critics believe, such actions would not have occurred**

**Drilling Links**

**triggers massive battle in congress and requires PC**

**Kraft, 12**

Michael E. Kraft and Norman J. Vig, 12, <http://www.cqpress.com/docs/college/Ch1-Vig-8e.pdf>

Michael E. Kraft is professor emeritus of political science and public affairs and Herbert Fisk Johnson Professor of Environmental Studies emeritus at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay. He is the author of Environmental Policy and Politics (5th ed., Pearson Longman 2011 ), co-author of Public Policy: Politics, Analysis, and Alternatives (4th edition, 2012), and co-author of Coming Clean: Information Disclosure and Environmental Performance (MIT Press 2011). In addition, he is co-editor of Environmental Policy : New Directions for the Twenty-First Century, 8th ed. (2012), with Norman J. Vig; Business and Environmental Policy (2007) and The Oxford Handbook of U.S. Environmental Policy (2012), with Sheldon Kamieniecki; and Toward Sustainable Communities: Transition and Transformations in Environmental Policy, 2nd ed. (2009), with Daniel A. Mazmanian.

Despite these notable pledges and actions, rising criticism of environmental programs also was evident throughout the 1990s and the first decade of the twenty-first century, both domestically and internationally. So too were a multiplicity of efforts to chart new policy directions. For example, intense opposition to environmental and natural resource policies arose in the 104th Congress (1995–1997), when the Republican Party took control of both the House and Senate for the first time in forty years. Ultimately, **much like the earlier efforts** in Ronald Reagan’s administration, that **antiregulatory campaign on Capitol Hill failed to gain** much public **support** at the time. 2 Nonetheless, **pitched battles over environmental and energy policy continued in every Congress** through the 112th (2011–2013), **and** they **were equally evident in** the executive branch, particularly in the Bush administration as it sought to rewrite **environmental rules and regulations to favor industry** and to increase development of U.S. **oil and natural gas supplies on public lands** (see Chapter 8). 3 Yet growing dissatisfaction with the effectiveness, efficiency, and equity of environmental policies was by no means confined to congressional conservatives and the Bush administration. It could be found among a broad array of interests, including the business community, environmental policy analysts, environmental justice groups, and state and local government officials. 4 Since 1992, **governments** at all levels **have struggled to redesign environmental policy** for the twenty-first century. Under Presidents Bill Clinton and George W. Bush, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) tried to “reinvent” environmental regulation through the use of collaborative decision making involving multiple stakeholders, public-private partnerships, market-based incentives, information disclosure, and enhanced flexibility in rulemaking and enforcement (see Chapters 8, 9, and 10). 5 Particularly during the Clinton administration, new emphases within the EPA and other federal agencies and departments on ecosystem management and sustainable development sought to foster comprehensive, integrated, and long-term strategies for environmental protection and natural resource management (see Chapter 8). 6 Many state and local governments have pursued similar goals with adoption of a wide range of innovative policies that promise to address some of the most important criticisms directed at contemporary environmental policy (see Chapters 2 and 11). The election of President Barack Obama in 2008 brought additional attention to innovative policy ideas, although less attention than many of Obama’s supporters had anticipated (see Chapter 4). Taken together, however, over the past two decades **we have seen a new sense of urgency emerge about climate change and other** third generation **environmental, energy**, and resource **problems and**, at least in some quarters, **a determination to address those problems despite weak economic conditions**. **The precise way** in which **Congress,** the states, and local governments **will change environmental policies** in the years to come **remains unclear**. The partisan gridlock of recent years may give way to greater consensus on the need to act; yet **policy change rarely comes easily in the U.S. political system. Its success likely depends on several key conditions**: public support for change, how the various policy actors stake out and defend their positions on the issues, the way the media cover these disputes, the relative influence of opposing interests, and the state of the economy. **Political leadership**, as always, **will play a role, especially in reconciling deep divisions between the major political parties on environmental protection** **and natural resource issues. Political conflict over the environment is not going to vanish any time soon**. Indeed, **it may well increase** as the United States and other nations struggle to define how they will respond to the latest generation of environmental problems and how they will reconcile their preferred policy actions with other priorities. The Role of Government and Politics The **high level of political conflict over environmental protection efforts** **recently underscores** the important role government plays in devising solutions to the nation’s and the world’s mounting environmental ills. Global climate change, population growth, the spread of toxic and hazardous chemicals, loss of biological diversity, and air and water pollution all require various actions by individuals and institutions at all levels of society and in both the public and private sectors. These actions range from scientific research and technological innovation to improved environmental education and significant changes in corporate and consumer behavior. As political scientists, we believe government has an indispensable role to play in environmental protection and improvement. The chapters in this volume thus focus on environmental policies and the government institutions and political processes that affect them. Our goal is to illuminate that role and to suggest needed changes and strategies.

**Plan unpopular - past votes prove**

**Goode 11**

Darren Goode, staff writer, Politico, May 18, 2011, "Senate slams GOP drilling bill", http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0511/55241.html

**A Senate** Republican **offshore drilling bill died** Wednesday **due to opposition from Democrats** and criticism from within the GOP that the measure didn't go far enough in enabling new production. **The 42-57 vote left sponsors well short of the needed 60** for the motion to proceed to pass. **Five Republicans voted no** — Sens. Jim DeMint, Mike Lee, Richard Shelby, Olympia Snowe and David Vitter. No Democrats voted yes; Finance Committee Chairman Max Baucus didn't vote.

**Most contentious energy issue – drains capital and support**

**Kornblut, 10**

Juliet Eilperin and Anne E. Kornblut, Washington Post Staff Writer, April 1, 2010, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/03/31/AR2010033100024.html?hpid=topnews

President **Obama's decision**, announced Wednesday, **to approve new** oil and gas **drilling off U.S. coasts** for the first time in decades **reflects a high-stakes calculation** by the White House: **Splitting the difference on the most contentious energy issues** could help secure a bipartisan climate deal this year. In what could represent the biggest expansion of offshore energy exploration in half a century, Obama announced that he will open the door to drilling off Virginia's coast, in other parts of the mid- and south Atlantic, in the eastern Gulf of Mexico, and in waters off Alaska. At the same time, he declared off-limits the waters off the West Coast and in Alaska's Bristol Bay, canceled four scheduled lease sales in Alaska and called for more study before allowing new lease sales in the Chukchi and Beaufort seas. What Interior Secretary Ken Salazar called "a new direction" in energy policy amounted to an offshore political gerrymander in which the administration barred drilling near states where it remains unpopular -- California and New Jersey -- and allowed it in places where it has significant support, such as Virginia and parts of Alaska and the Southeast. Some conservative critics questioned whether the policy will have any real impact on energy production, while **liberals decried the risks to the environment.** But the White House's key audience -- undecided senators who will determine whether a climate bill succeeds on Capitol Hill this year -- suggested that the move had helped revive the legislation's prospects. A string of senators, including Alaska's Mark Begich (D) and Lisa Murkowski (R), Louisiana's Mary Landrieu (D), New Hampshire's Judd Gregg (R), and Virginia Democrats Mark Warner and James Webb, praised the strategy. They have urged the administration to use a climate bill to help boost domestic energy production, through expansion of oil and gas drilling and nuclear power, and Begich and Gregg said Wednesday's announcement made them more optimistic about a deal on the bill than they have been in months. Noting that Obama has also offered recent support for more nuclear production, Gregg said such moves show that the administration is "genuinely trying to approach the energy production issue in a multifaceted way and a realistic way, rather than listening to people on their left." Landrieu concurred, saying that Obama is "sending as clear a signal as possible that he is willing to compromise in a way that will bring forth a great energy and climate bill, and he wants Republicans to be a part of it." But coastal lawmakers such as Democratic Sens. Benjamin L. Cardin and Barbara A. Mikulski of Maryland joined environmentalists in blasting the change as unnecessary, and said it could jeopardize fisheries and tourist attractions. **Wooing proponents of drilling "cuts both ways**," Cardin warned. "**You can lose support if you do things that have environmental risks."**

**Expanding offshore drilling spurs partisan battle and committee gridlock**

**E&E Daily, 12**  (Environment and Energy Daily, 1/17, lexis)

Despite an impressive track record at clearing energy and public lands measures, **the Senate Energy** and Natural Resources **Committee didn't see a single measure debated on the Senate floor in 2011**. Retiring committee Chairman Jeff Bingaman (D-N.M.) is likely to keep the pressure on Senate leaders to take those measures up in the full chamber as his time in the Senate comes to a close at the end of this year. And he'll also likely encourage discussions of his upcoming clean energy standard legislation. The measure isn't likely to gain much traction among Republicans in either chamber -- a fact Bingaman acknowledges -- but he says it will still be important to start debate on the issue. Other highlights Lessons learned from 2011 **The committee** last year kept up its famously bipartisan appearances, churning out an impressive 61 bills. But the panel still **suffered from bouts of partisanship that brought action on certain issues** -- like a response to the 2010 Gulf of Mexico oil spill -- **to a standstill.** The addition of several new tea party-backed GOP freshmen to the roster also caused some strife at committee meetings and in negotiations on seemingly noncontroversial bills. **Head-butting isn't likely to go away on key issues** as election-year politics dominate discussions throughout the Capitol. CES: Bingaman has vowed to float legislation early this session that would create a federal clean energy standard requiring utilities to generate a certain percentage of their electricity from low-carbon sources in the coming decades. Once introduced, the measure is sure to get ample face time in the committee, but partisan roadblocks in the full Senate and a sure death in the House will likely prevent it from moving beyond the panel. Smaller bipartisan bills: The committee last year cleared dozens of smaller energy bills on a bipartisan basis -- many of them breakouts from a broad 2009 energy bill that stalled in the full Senate -- but none have seen floor time. Bingaman will likely push Senate leaders to move on some of those measures as he sees the clock ticking on his time in the Senate. Offshore drilling: **Efforts** last year **to advance offshore drilling** safety language **stalled** after ranking member Lisa Murkowski (R-Alaska) and Sen. Mary Landrieu (D-La.) urged the inclusion of coastal revenue-sharing language in a bill responding to the 2010 oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico. Bingaman isn't likely to advance the legislation this session, but **the committee could take a look at other offshore drilling issues**, such as Interior's five-year leasing plan. **Republicans and the oil industry want to see the areas** included in that plan **beefed up, while environmentalists and many Democrats say it already infringes on too many sensitive areas**.

**Offshore drilling sparks fierce opposition in committees and senate**

**E&E Daily, 12** (Environment and Energy Daily, 1/17, lexis)

**The battles won't be pretty.** **But they** -- along with the campaigns, of course -- **will be what occupies Washington** during the next year. What follows is a look at the likely agendas for key congressional committees over the next several months: Cont… HOUSE NATURAL RESOURCES The agenda for 2012 Rep. Doc Hastings (R-Wash.). **Energy development on the nation's lands and waters will continue to set the agenda for the Natural Resources Committee** in 2012. Expect to see plenty of Interior Secretary Ken Salazar and his agency heads on the witness stand as the committee continues its assault on the Obama administration's policies. "Republicans on the committee will continue to focus on creating new American jobs, reducing the debt and federal deficit, protecting access to our nation's natural resources and conducting oversight of the administration's policies and actions," said committee spokeswoman Jill Strait. Last year saw 115 hearings and markups of a dizzying number of bills. "I think 2012 will be equally as busy," Strait said. Other highlights Lessons learned from 2011 **The last session** included 115 hearings and **saw the passage of several significant Republican-led bills promoting offshore drilling**, renewable energy, copper mining, and hunting and fishing, among many others. **But** while some of the bills passed the full House, **only a few small-scale proposals passed the Senate, Democrats point out**. Regardless of who is to blame, lawmakers know they will need to work much harder to achieve bipartisan compromises this session, particularly in an election year. Cutting red tape: The committee's focus will largely mirror last year's agenda: job creation through increased energy development on public lands and waters. Expect early action on a trio of bills introduced late last year that would allow oil and gas leasing in the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, allow drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and reinstate a scrapped George W. Bush administration plan to promote oil shale development in the West. The bills, which are designed to raise new revenues to shore up the Highway Trust Fund, will see action "in the coming weeks or months," according to a statement this month by House Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) (Greenwire, Jan. 9). Renewables: The committee will continue seeking ways to streamline the federal permitting process. A committee aide said Chairman Doc Hastings (R-Wash.) plans to push for House passage of four bills his panel reported last July that would shorten National Environmental Policy Act reviews for low-impact renewable energy projects. A committee aide said the panel will explore other ways to unlock the vast potential to site wind, solar, hydro and other energy projects on public lands. Endangered species: In addition to NEPA, the committee will seek to overhaul the Endangered Species Act, a nearly 40-year-old law critics contend has stymied access to domestic resources. At its first hearing on the matter last month, Republicans on the committee blamed the frequency of citizens' lawsuits that many argue have hamstrung the Fish and Wildlife Service (E&E Daily, Dec. 7, 2010). The committee will hold additional oversight hearings to examine the law's strengths and weaknesses and explore potential improvements. The committee may also review a landmark settlement between the Obama administration and environmentalists that will force the administration to issue final listing decisions on hundreds of species over the next five years. Oversight: The committee will continue its oversight of major Obama administration policies, including its five-year offshore leasing plan, a proposed rewrite of the Office of Surface Mining's stream buffer rule, national ocean planning and the folding of OSM into the Bureau of Land Management. The committee heard from Interior Secretary Ken Salazar shortly after he released the agency's five-year leasing plan, which calls for continued sales in the Gulf of Mexico and Alaska, but excluded the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, angering Republicans. Expect to see much more of Salazar on the witness stand as his agency finalizes the leasing plan and issues other decisions on Alaskan offshore drilling, hydraulic fracturing regulations and oil shale. Oceans: Hastings plans to continue his campaign against the administration's National Ocean Policy. Spurred by last week's release of a draft implementation plan, Hastings said he would hold additional hearings to vet the policy, which he warned could place portions of the ocean off-limits for recreation, fishing or development. Hastings held two hearings last year on the plan, targeting it as a "burdensome" federal effort that could destroy jobs and hinder economic growth. Marine advocates applauded the plan. Access: Republicans will continue attacking Obama policies they argue have unfairly locked up public lands. While no markup has been set, the committee will continue to push a bill to release tens of millions of acres of forests the Clinton administration placed off-limits to roads and timber harvests. The bill, which would also lift interim protections by the Bureau of Land Management, is the greatest threat to public lands in a generation, environmentalists have warned. Expect a continued focus on land management decisions, including the new Forest Service planning rule, that could affect access for motorized users like off-highway vehicles and snowmobiles. **Democratic defense: Committee Democrats** led by Rep. Ed Markey of Massachusetts **will continue to portray the majority as beholden to fossil fuel interests, pointing to its failure to consider the ranking member's proposal to implement offshore drilling reforms recommended by the** president's **BP spill commission. They will continue to point to deficit reduction measures that target** oil industry tax breaks; **leased, but undeveloped, public lands**; and royalty-free mineral development. In addition, **committee Democrats say they will fight hard to stifle Republican attempts to allow oil and gas drilling** in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, new uranium claims near the Grand Canyon and limit or reduce funding for land acquisition and conservation. The minority will also promote accelerated development of solar, wind and other clean energy on public lands.

**Expanding offshore drilling only** *costs* **political capital – alienates dems and environmental lobby and GOP and industry complain no matter what**

**Hobson 12**

Margaret Kriz Hobson, E&E reporter, EnergyWire: Wednesday, April 18, 2012

http://www.eenews.net/public/energywire/2012/04/18/1

OFFSHORE DRILLING: **Obama's development plans gain little political traction** in years since Gulf spill President Obama is embracing the offshore oil and gas development policies he proposed in early 2010 but were sidelined in the shadow of the Deepwater Horizon oil spill. Two years after the BP PLC oil rig exploded, killing 11 people and causing the worst oil spill in U.S. history, **Obama's "all of the above" energy policy includes** **offshore** drilling provisions that are nearly identical to his **aggressive** March 2010 **drilling plan**. Since the moratorium on offshore oil drilling ended in late 2010, the administration expanded oil and gas development in the western and central Gulf of Mexico and announced plans for lease sales in the eastern Gulf. The White House appears poised to allow Royal Dutch Shell PLC to begin exploring for oil this summer in Alaska's Beaufort and Chukchi seas and to open oil industry access to the Cook Inlet, south of Anchorage. The administration is also paving the way for oil and gas seismic studies along the mid- and south Atlantic coasts, the first such survey in 30 years. While opening more offshore lands to oil and gas development, the Obama administration has also taken steps to make offshore oil drilling safer, according to a report card issued yesterday by Oil Spill Commission Action, an oversight panel formed by seven members of President Obama's oil spill commission. That report criticized Congress for failing to adopt new oil spill safety laws but praised the Interior Department and industry for making progress in improving offshore oil development safety, environmental protection and oil spill preparation. An environmental group was less complimentary. A report yesterday by Oceana charged that the measures adopted by government and industry are "woefully inadequate." As the 2012 presidential campaign heats up and gasoline prices remain stuck near $4 per gallon, **Obama's offshore oil development policies aren't winning him any political capital.** **The environmental community hates the drilling proposals. The Republicans and oil industry officials complain** that the White House hasn't gone far enough. And independent voters are confused by the president's rhetoric. According to the GOP political firm Resurgent Republic, independent voters in Colorado and Virginia don't understand what Obama's "all of the above" energy mantra means. The report said, however, that once the policy was "described as oil, gas, coal, nuclear power, solar and other alternative energies, participants became enthusiastic and view such a strategy as credible and necessary to becoming more energy independent." A recent Gallup poll indicated that **American voters are polarized on energy issues**. The survey found that 47 percent of the public believes energy development is more important than environmental protection, while 41 percent of the public ranks protecting the environment as a bigger priority. In that political climate, Obama's offshore oil development policies are not likely to affect the nation's most conservative or liberal voters, noted Larry Sabato, director of the University of Virginia's Center for Politics. "The environmentalists have no place to go except Obama, and **Obama isn't going to convince any conservatives or Republicans to back him" based on his oil and gas proposals**, Sabato said. "He's obviously aiming at swing independents," Sabato added. "He's trying to show that he's pursuing a middle path, the one many independents like. Maybe it will work." Back to the original plan, minus 2 pieces Obama's all-of-the-above energy policy is in keeping with his pre-oil-spill offshore oil and gas development proposal. After the Deepwater Horizon disaster, the White House slapped a six-month moratorium on all new oil and gas development. Since the moratorium ended, Obama has systematically reintroduced most of the early oil development proposals. Two pieces of the old plan are missing. Obama backtracked on his proposal to allow oil exploration off Virginia's coast. The new East Coast offshore plan lays the groundwork for seismic studies, but not drilling, along the mid- and south Atlantic. The White House also dropped a proposal to allow exploration in the eastern Gulf of Mexico within 125 miles of Florida, an area off limits due to a congressional moratorium. During 2010 negotiations, the administration offered to allow oil leasing in the region if Congress lifted the moratorium and passed a global warming bill. When the climate change legislation died, however, the drilling provision lost White House favor. Since the Republicans took control of the House in 2011, GOP leaders have advanced a series of bills that would go far beyond Obama's offshore oil drilling policies, essentially allowing development along all U.S. shores. But those measures have been thwarted by the Democrat-controlled Senate. The Republicans and industry officials long for the offshore oil and gas plan floated by former President George W. Bush during his last days in office. That proposal would have offered 31 federal lease sales and included regions off the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. By comparison, Obama's 2012 to 2017 leasing blueprint includes a dozen sites in Alaska and the Gulf of Mexico and excludes the West Coast and northern East Coast. American Petroleum Institute officials say that Obama's policies have kept 87 percent of federal offshore acreage off limits to oil and gas development. "We need more certainty in the process and knowledge that things are going to move forward at a much better pace so that companies can plan for and make investments in U.S. projects," argued Erik Milito, API's group director for upstream and industry operations But White House officials take issue with API's explanation. Interior Department officials say that thanks to Obama administration policies, more than 75 percent of undiscovered technically recoverable offshore oil and natural gas resources will be open to exploration and development in the next five years. "Those who claim that the areas that will be offered constitute few total acres aren't paying attention to where the oil and gas resources are," Heather Zichal, Obama's deputy assistant for energy and climate change, wrote in a White House blog. "[T]hat's where we are focusing our attention, in places like the Western Gulf and the Central Gulf, an offshore area which, according to our resource estimates, has nearly double the resource potential of any other." Meanwhile, **environmentalists are fighting the administration's return to Obama's pre-oil spill energy policies**. Charging that the White House and Congress are ignoring the lessons of the BP oil spill, the green groups are focusing their opposition on the president's plans to advance oil and gas development along the Alaska shores and parts of the East Coast.

**Their consessions ev is about obama’s attempt to get GOP on board for a climate bill – WHICH FAILED – the plan only makes dems furious with no upside**

**Hobson 12**

Margaret Kriz Hobson, E&E reporter, EnergyWire: Wednesday, April 18, 2012

http://www.eenews.net/public/energywire/2012/04/18/1

OFFSHORE DRILLING: Obama's development plans gain little political traction in years since Gulf spill President Obama is embracing the offshore oil and gas development policies he proposed in early 2010 but were sidelined in the shadow of the Deepwater Horizon oil spill. Two years after the BP PLC oil rig exploded, killing 11 people and causing the worst oil spill in U.S. history, Obama's "all of the above" energy policy includes offshore drilling provisions that are nearly identical to his aggressive March 2010 drilling plan. Since the moratorium on offshore oil drilling ended in late 2010, the administration expanded oil and gas development in the western and central Gulf of Mexico and announced plans for lease sales in the eastern Gulf. The White House appears poised to allow Royal Dutch Shell PLC to begin exploring for oil this summer in Alaska's Beaufort and Chukchi seas and to open oil industry access to the Cook Inlet, south of Anchorage. The administration is also paving the way for oil and gas seismic studies along the mid- and south Atlantic coasts, the first such survey in 30 years. While opening more offshore lands to oil and gas development, the Obama administration has also taken steps to make offshore oil drilling safer, according to a report card issued yesterday by Oil Spill Commission Action, an oversight panel formed by seven members of President Obama's oil spill commission. That report criticized Congress for failing to adopt new oil spill safety laws but praised the Interior Department and industry for making progress in improving offshore oil development safety, environmental protection and oil spill preparation. An environmental group was less complimentary. A report yesterday by Oceana charged that the measures adopted by government and industry are "woefully inadequate." As the 2012 presidential campaign heats up and gasoline prices remain stuck near $4 per gallon, Obama's offshore oil development policies aren't winning him any political capital. The environmental community hates the drilling proposals. The Republicans and oil industry officials complain that the White House hasn't gone far enough. And independent voters are confused by the president's rhetoric. According to the GOP political firm Resurgent Republic, independent voters in Colorado and Virginia don't understand what Obama's "all of the above" energy mantra means. The report said, however, that once the policy was "described as oil, gas, coal, nuclear power, solar and other alternative energies, participants became enthusiastic and view such a strategy as credible and necessary to becoming more energy independent." A recent Gallup poll indicated that American voters are polarized on energy issues. The survey found that 47 percent of the public believes energy development is more important than environmental protection, while 41 percent of the public ranks protecting the environment as a bigger priority. In that political climate, Obama's offshore oil development policies are not likely to affect the nation's most conservative or liberal voters, noted Larry Sabato, director of the University of Virginia's Center for Politics. "The environmentalists have no place to go except Obama, and Obama isn't going to convince any conservatives or Republicans to back him" based on his oil and gas proposals, Sabato said. "He's obviously aiming at swing independents," Sabato added. "He's trying to show that he's pursuing a middle path, the one many independents like. Maybe it will work." Back to the original plan, minus 2 pieces Obama's all-of-the-above energy policy is in keeping with his pre-oil-spill offshore oil and gas development proposal. After the Deepwater Horizon disaster, the White House slapped a six-month moratorium on all new oil and gas development. Since the moratorium ended, Obama has systematically reintroduced most of the early oil development proposals. Two pieces of the old plan are missing. Obama backtracked on his proposal to allow oil exploration off Virginia's coast. The new East Coast offshore plan lays the groundwork for seismic studies, but not drilling, along the mid- and south Atlantic. The White House also dropped a proposal to allow exploration in the eastern Gulf of Mexico within 125 miles of Florida, an area off limits due to a congressional moratorium. **During 2010 negotiations, the administration offered to allow oil leasing** in the region **if Congress lifted the moratorium and passed a global warming bill.** When **the climate change legislation died**, however, the drilling provision lost White House favor. Since the Republicans took control of the House in 2011, **GOP leaders have advanced a series of bills that would go far beyond Obama's offshore oil drilling policies,** essentially allowing development along all U.S. shores. **But those measures have been thwarted by the Democrat-controlled Senate.** The Republicans and industry officials long for the offshore oil and gas plan floated by former President George W. Bush during his last days in office. That proposal would have offered 31 federal lease sales and included regions off the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. By comparison, Obama's 2012 to 2017 leasing blueprint includes a dozen sites in Alaska and the Gulf of Mexico and excludes the West Coast and northern East Coast. American Petroleum Institute officials say that Obama's policies have kept 87 percent of federal offshore acreage off limits to oil and gas development. "We need more certainty in the process and knowledge that things are going to move forward at a much better pace so that companies can plan for and make investments in U.S. projects," argued Erik Milito, API's group director for upstream and industry operations But White House officials take issue with API's explanation. Interior Department officials say that thanks to Obama administration policies, more than 75 percent of undiscovered technically recoverable offshore oil and natural gas resources will be open to exploration and development in the next five years. "Those who claim that the areas that will be offered constitute few total acres aren't paying attention to where the oil and gas resources are," Heather Zichal, Obama's deputy assistant for energy and climate change, wrote in a White House blog. "[T]hat's where we are focusing our attention, in places like the Western Gulf and the Central Gulf, an offshore area which, according to our resource estimates, has nearly double the resource potential of any other." Meanwhile, environmentalists are fighting the administration's return to Obama's pre-oil spill energy policies. Charging that the White House and Congress are ignoring the lessons of the BP oil spill, the green groups are focusing their opposition on the president's plans to advance oil and gas development along the Alaska shores and parts of the East Coast.

**No turns---liberals hate the plan and conservatives won’t give Obama credit for it**

**Walsh 11**, Bryan, TIME Senior editor, November 9, “Why Obama’s Offshore Drilling Plan Isn’t Making Anyone Happy,” http://science.time.com/2011/11/09/why-obamas-offshore-drilling-plan-isnt-making-anyone-happy/#ixzz26snhDbbI

Nonetheless, Obama has set a target of reducing U.S. oil imports by a third by 2025, and greater domestic oil production is going to have to be a part of that—including oil from the Arctic. Unfortunately for the President, **no one’s likely to cheer him**. Conservatives and the oil industry **won’t be happy** until just about **every** square **foot** of the country is available for drilling—though it is worth noting that oil production offshore has actually increased under Obama—and environmentalists aren’t going to rally to support **any sort of expanded drilling**. With energy, as with so many other issues for Obama, **it’s lonely at the center**.

**Relaxing drilling restrictions empirically causes backlash---no risk of offense**

**Broder 10** John is a writer for the New York Times. “Obama to Open Offshore Areas to Oil Drilling for First Time,” March 31, http://www.nytimes.com/2010/03/31/science/earth/31energy.html?\_r=0

But while Mr. Obama has staked out middle ground on other environmental matters — supporting nuclear power, for example — the sheer breadth of the **offshore drilling** decision **will take some of his supporters aback. And it is no sure thing that it will win support** for a climate bill **from undecided senators close to the oil industry**, like Lisa Murkowski, Republican of Alaska, or Mary L. Landrieu, Democrat of Louisiana.¶ The Senate is expected to take up a climate bill in the next few weeks — the last chance to enact such legislation before midterm election concerns take over. Mr. Obama and his allies in the Senate have already made significant concessions on coal and nuclear power to try to win votes from Republicans and moderate Democrats. The new plan now grants one of the biggest items on the oil industry’s wish list — access to vast areas of the Outer Continental Shelf for drilling.¶ But even as Mr. Obama curries favors with pro-drilling interests, **he risks a backlash from some coastal governors, senators and environmental advocates, who say that the relatively small amounts of oil to be gained in the offshore areas are not worth the environmental risks.**

**Obama can** only lose **political capital by advocating offshore drilling**

**Hobson 4/18** Margaret is a writer for E&E Publishing. “**OFFSHORE DRILLING: Obama's development plans gain little political traction in years since Gulf spill**,” 2012, http://www.eenews.net/public/energywire/2012/04/18/1

President **Obama is embracing** the **offshore oil and gas development** policies he proposed in early 2010 but were sidelined in the shadow of the Deepwater Horizon oil spill.¶ Two years after the BP PLC oil rig exploded, killing 11 people and causing the worst oil spill in U.S. history, Obama's "all of the above" energy policy includes offshore drilling provisions that are nearly identical to his aggressive March 2010 drilling plan.¶ Since the moratorium on offshore oil drilling ended in late 2010, the administration expanded oil and gas development in the western and central Gulf of Mexico and announced plans for lease sales in the eastern Gulf. The White House appears poised to allow Royal Dutch Shell PLC to begin exploring for oil this summer in Alaska's Beaufort and Chukchi seas and to open oil industry access to the Cook Inlet, south of Anchorage. The administration is also paving the way for oil and gas seismic studies along the mid- and south Atlantic coasts, the first such survey in 30 years.¶ While opening more offshore lands to oil and gas development, the Obama administration has also taken steps to make offshore oil drilling safer, according to a report card issued yesterday by Oil Spill Commission Action, an oversight panel formed by seven members of President Obama's oil spill commission.¶ That report criticized Congress for failing to adopt new oil spill safety laws but praised the Interior Department and industry for making progress in improving offshore oil development safety, environmental protection and oil spill preparation.¶ An environmental group was less complimentary. A report yesterday by Oceana charged that the measures adopted by government and industry are "woefully inadequate."¶ As the 2012 presidential campaign heats up and gasoline prices remain stuck near $4 per gallon, **Obama's offshore** oil **development policies aren't winning him any political capital. The environmental community hates the drilling proposals.** The **Republicans and oil industry officials complain that the White House hasn't gone far enough. And independent voters are confused by the president's rhetoric.**

**Plan sparks a fight kills pc**

**Morgan, 11** (Curtis, Tampa Bay Times, “A year after Deepwater Horizon disaster, opposition to oil drilling fades” 4/18, <http://www.tampabay.com/news/environment/a-year-after-deepwater-horizon-disaster-opposition-to-oil-drilling-fades/1164429>) **Nelson=Florida Senator Bill Nelson, Fuller = Manley Fuller, president of the Florida Wildlife Federation**

In Washington, the Obama administration has adopted what Interior Secretary Salazar called a "thoughtful and deliberate approach'' to reopening the gulf, with a new oversight agency and new safety measures — notably, one mandating that the industry develop deep-water containment systems for worst-case blowouts, like the one that destroyed the Deepwater Horizon.

In October, the White House lifted the drilling ban it imposed after the BP spill but didn't start issuing new permits until last month, approving 10 new deep water wells so far, with 15 more in process. The administration also agreed to open new territory for exploration by selling new leases — but only in the already heavily drilled central and western gulf.

The three bills approved by a House committee last week don't target Florida waters specifically but lawmakers potentially could use them as tools to carve out prime areas for drilling, or shrink or lift the moratorium.

For now, with the House and Senate controlled by different parties, **it's doubtful any drilling bill can make it out of Congress**. Nelson and most environmentalists believe the ban on Florida's federal waters can survive political pressure and maneuvering.

"President Obama would have to lose and Bill Nelson would have to lose and they'd have to be replaced by people who want to remove that boundary,'' said Fuller of the Florida Wildlife Federation. "I don't think that is going to happen.''

A more serious threat, they say, is the possibility of a future Florida Legislature opening up state-controlled waters. That move would make it politically difficult to justify a continuing federal ban.

A coalition of environmental groups, Save Our Seas, Beaches and Shores, launched a petition drive after the 2009 House vote to put a ban on drilling in state waters into the Florida Constitution. Former Gov. Charlie Crist's effort to do the same thing during a special legislative session in July proved dead on arrival.

So far, Fuller acknowledged, only a few thousand signatures have been gathered through an online site, far short of the nearly 700,000 needed. In February, Crist's former chief financial officer, Alex Sink, who lost the governor's race to Scott, agreed to co-chair the petition drive with the goal of getting an amendment proposal on the ballot by 2012 or, more realistically, the following year.

Fuller doesn't anticipate lawmakers trying to **ram through a divisive drilling bill in the near future** but "that is one reason why we want it in the Constitution. We don't want to see it as a possibility at all.''

**Plan’s empirically unpopular in Congress**

**Goode, 11** – staff writer for Politico (Darren, Politico, 5/18, "Senate slams GOP drilling bill", http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0511/55241.html

A Senate Republican offshore drilling bill died Wednesday due to opposition from Democrats and criticism from within the GOP that the measure didn't go far enough in enabling new production.

The 42-57 vote left sponsors well short of the needed 60 for the motion to proceed to pass.

Five Republicans voted no — Sens. Jim DeMint, Mike Lee, Richard Shelby, Olympia Snowe and David Vitter. No Democrats voted yes; Finance Committee Chairman Max Baucus didn't vote.

**Congress will fight the plan – Democrats see it as vital to pay back environmentalist support from the election**

**Goldenberg**, 11/7/**12** -the US environment correspondent of the Guardian and is based in Washington DC (Suzanne, “Obama stokes expectations for second term” EnviroLib,

http://envirolib.org/news/obama-stokes-expectations-for-second-term/

Barack Obama‘s invocation of “the destructive power of a warming planet” in his victory speech has stoked expectation that he will act on climate change in his second term.

Environmental campaigners are already mobilising to hold the president to that promise.

They argued Obama’s re-election, amid the devastation of superstorm Sandy, was a clear mandate for action on climate change, in stark contrast to Mitt Romney, who turned sea-level rise into a laugh line in the biggest speech of his political career.

Campaigners put Obama on immediate notice, calling an 18 November demonstration at the White House to demand he scrap the controversial Keystone XL pipeline.

“In the wake of hurricane Sandy, as the warmest year in American history draws to a close, as the disastrous drought lingers on in the midwest, everyone is looking for ways to make a real difference in the fight to slow climate change,” said an open letter from 350.org and the Sierra Club.

But a strategic decision by the White House in 2009 to downplay climate change, and Obama’s avoidance of the issue during the campaign, makes it tricky for the president to now claim that he was elected to act on the issue.

The Republicans’ continued control of the House of Representatives will also continue to limit Obama’s scope for action.

However, environmental campaigners said Sandy – and an endorsement from New York city mayor, Michael Bloomberg, due to Obama’s position on climate change – create public space for the president to act.

“Of course president Obama certainly did not take up the cause in the way we had hoped but he has indicated in numerous events and in the New Yorker and Rolling Stone that climate will be a top priority for his second term,” said Bets Taylor, president of the climate strategy firm Breakthrough Solutions. “There is reason to feel hope. We moved from silence to a growing mandate for action.”

A number of newly elected Democrats in the Senate and the House of Representatives also owe their victories, in part, to support from environmental campaign groups, giving greens more allies in Congress.

Any **new effort to loosen restrictions will be a fight – for every group that supports the plan, powerful groups will fight it**

**Dloughy, 11/7**/12 – reporter in the Hearst Newspapers Washington Bureau (Jennifer, “Obama and the environment - a new path?” San Francisco Chronicle,

<http://www.sfgate.com/science/article/Obama-and-the-environment-a-new-path-4018611.php>

President Obama enters a second term in the White House free to toughen regulations on domestic drilling despite industry objections - and to approve natural gas exports and the controversial Keystone XL pipeline without fear of alienating environmentalists he needed at the ballot box.

But the newly unfettered president will be navigating many of the same political obstacles he faced during the first term, when his administration balanced new pollution regulations by delaying mercury rules for power plants and giving the oil industry big concessions as part of other environmental mandates.

Obama also will be facing a sharply divided Congress, with Republicans eager to use their House control to undercut new environmental requirements and Democrats in charge of the Senate pushing back against efforts to weaken them.

"The president faces checks and balances from Congress," noted Benjamin Salisbury, an analyst with FBR Capital Markets. "He also faces checks and balances from litigation, from industry and negotiations and environmental groups."

**Gas Links – General**

**Plan wrecks capital**

**Dicker 12** Daniel is a Senior Columnist at The Street. “Why Isn't Natural Gas an Election Issue?” 9/4, http://www.thestreet.com/story/11684440/1/why-isnt-natural-gas-an-election-issue.html?cm\_ven=GOOGLEN

**Why has this opportunity towards increased reliance on natural gas been so obvious and yet so difficult for politicians of both parties to embrace?¶** It hasn't been solely because 2012 is an election year. Boone Pickens was on CNBC last week marking the fourth anniversary of his "Pickens Plan," the failed congressional effort to invest in truck natural gas engines and fuelling infrastructure to run them on.¶ In fact, **if anyone wanted to see political partisanship in action** slowing the real economic progress this nation could make, **they'd find no better example than the history of the Pickens plan and other natural gas initiatives in Washington.¶** **Both radical wings of each party have made advocating natural gas use impossible. Democratic environmentalists are concerned about hydraulic fracturing and its possible impact to aquifers. Republicans are reluctant to approve further federal spending of any kind as well as risk a charge of "picking winners" in natural gas -- a charge they have made successfully against Democrats.**¶ Of course, both radical wings of both parties are wrong: Overwhelming evidence from every independent research source has concluded that hydraulic fracturing of shale for natural gas has proven to be safe to our water supplies and is getting safer all the time.¶ **Republican reticence to support natural gas expansion belies a long history of government incentives for developing new energy sources**, from as far back as our development of coal to our much discussed modern tax incentives for crude oil exploration and production.¶ It is a fact that our government has been picking winners in energy for as long as there's been government.¶ The advantages of natural gas conversion and greater use are obvious but bear repeating. Natural gas is a domestic source of energy and promises energy independence here in the U.S. Production, transport and building of infrastructure for natural gas would mean millions of new jobs. Natural gas prices are literally half that of competing oil and gasoline. Finally, carbon emissions for natural gas are about a third that for coal and other fossil fuels.¶ What's not to like?¶ But it seems both **radical wings of each party continue to wield enormous influence**. Neither candidate has made natural gas a cornerstone of a new and necessary energy policy.

**The plan’s controversial---makes Obama seem in bed with natural gas**

**Berman 12** Dan is a writer at Politico. “**When it comes to natural gas, Obama can’t win,”** 5/16, http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0512/76402.html

President Barack **Obama talked up natural gas** in his State of the Union address, his top aides have held dozens of meetings with natural gas industry leaders and his administration has given the industry what it wanted on two big regulatory issues.¶ **What he’s gotten in return: a giant headache.¶** **Industry backers have hammered away at virtually all of the White House’s rule-making efforts** while pouring millions of dollars into campaigns fighting Obama’s reelection.¶ **At the same time, environmentalists and** even **some Republicans have complained that natural gas is too cozy with the White House.¶** The gas industry’s had plenty of access. This year, the White House Office of Management and Budget held at least a dozen meetings on fracking with senior officials from companies like ExxonMobil, Anadarko and BP, as well as Republican congressional staffers, tribal leaders and industry lobby shops.¶ But the White House seems unable to decide how close it wants to be to the industry. Obama and Cabinet officials like Energy Secretary Steven Chu, Interior Secretary Ken Salazar and EPA chief Lisa Jackson consistently praise natural gas. And recent headlines have trumpeted the newfound closeness; Bloomberg, for instance, went with “Obama Warms to Energy Industry by Supporting Natural Gas” while National Journal chose: “White House’s Coziness With Big Oil Irks GOP.”¶ White House energy adviser Heather Zichal insisted Monday that the relationship isn’t that simple.¶ “It’s safe to say the notion that we rolled out the welcome mat or have this hunky-dory relationship where we’re all holding hands and singing ‘Kumbaya’ is not exactly where we’re at today,” Zichal said at an American Petroleum Institute event.¶ “What I can say is that we were in the middle of working on a number of regulations that directly impact the oil and gas industry,” she added. “There was no way for us to finalize a regulation that made sense without us actually engaging with the industry.”¶ The past several weeks have demonstrated the love-hate relationship with industry.¶ On April 13, Obama signed an executive order meant to coordinate the administration’s activities on natural gas and perhaps answer criticism that the administration is trying to end hydraulic fracturing. Industry lobbyists met that afternoon with Zichal.¶ The White House press office even blasted out a release quoting supportive statements from places like the American Petroleum Institute, Business Roundtable and Dow Chemical.¶ But when the EPA and Interior Department each rolled out their much-anticipated rules regarding fracking, they were hammered by the industry and its GOP allies. And when Sen. Jim Inhofe (R-Okla.) started a media blitz using a two-year-old video of a regional EPA administrator saying he wanted to “crucify” law-breaking oil and gas companies, some of the same groups that had praised the executive order called for the person to be fired (he stepped down within five days).¶ Making things worse for the White House, **environmentalists who are happy the agencies were tackling fracking in the first place complained that the rules were watered down.¶** “I agree it seems like they’re trying to somehow make the industry happy, but we think that the White House absolutely should be holding the industry to a much higher standard,” said Amy Mall of the Natural Resources Defense Council. “We know the industry can operate with cleaner and safer methods.”

**Empirics prove the plan’s controversial**

Tom **Barnes**, Contributor, **12** [“Natural gas extraction tax debated in House,” Post-Gazette Harrisburg Bureau, March 29, http://www.post-gazette.com/stories/local/state/natural-gas-extraction-tax-debated-in-house-265999/?print=1]

HARRISBURG -- House **Democrats and Republicans wrangled** for five hours Tuesday **in a bitter partisan debate over** whether to enact a hefty new tax on extracting **natural gas** from Marcellus Shale, but the issue still has a long way to go.¶ **Democrats favored the measure**, called Senate Bill 1155, wh**ile Republicans were generally opposed.** It would impose a severance tax of 39 cents per thousand cubic feet (MCF) of natural gas extracted from the vast areas of underground shale in Pennsylvania. It would generate $120 million this fiscal year, $326 million next year, $408 million in 2012 and $495 million in 2013.¶ **But even the supporters said the bill was just "a first step," with difficult negotiations expected** with the Republican-controlled Senate. Many senators favor a lower tax rate, like one in Arkansas, which has a 1.5 percent tax on the market value of the extracted gas for the first several years.¶ **The rhetoric over the bill was loud from both sides. "It's unconscionable that these gas drillers don't pay a severance tax**," said Rep. Greg Vitali, D-Delaware, adding that all other 24 states with Marcellus drilling have a tax.¶ "These [gas] people are making tons of money, billions in gross profits," he said. "They hired a former Pennsylvania governor for $900,000 [as a lobbyist]. They gave a [Republican] candidate for governor nearly $400,000. A rate of 39 cents per MCF is fair and reasonable. They can afford it."¶ Rep. Barbara McIlvaine Smith, D-Chester, said, "We are the only shale state without a shale tax. People must think we have a big S on our forehead -- for stupid."¶ Rep. Bryan Lentz, D-Delaware, added, "If this tax is defeated, the headlines will read 'Corporations Win, People Lose.' If you vote against this bill you are doing the bidding of the gas industry, which can and should pay its fair share."¶ **Republicans strongly disagreed, claiming such a high tax will stifle the drilling industry as it gets going in the state,** providing thousands of jobs and other types of taxes to the state and localities where drilling is going on.¶ GOP legislators also objected that the bill was unconstitutional, because House Democrats on Monday had taken a measure on a different subject, which the Senate had already passed, and added totally new tax language to it. Republicans said that legally, revenue-raising bills must start in the House, not the Senate.¶ Republicans also objected that the rewritten bill provides $97 million -- 80 percent of the $120 million expected from the tax in the first year -- to fill a state budget hole, rather than helping replenish the nearly bankrupt Environmental Stewardship Fund, which protects farmland and open space.¶ "People are fed up with higher taxes," Rep. Scott Hutchinson, R-Venango said. "**There's a firestorm sweeping across the nation and state.** People don't want us to use this money to feed the Leviathan called state government."¶ "To come in with the highest tax rate in the country is unbelievable," said Rep. Daryl Metcalfe, R-Cranberry. "It will kill jobs in Pennsylvania."¶ Rep. Matt Baker, R-Tioga, said, "Like sharks in a feeding frenzy, big state government preys on drillers and landowners. It will impede job creation. This is the wrong way to go. It's a monumental tax, the largest in the whole country."¶ Rep. Dan Frankel, D-Squirrel Hill, insisted that contrary to what opponents said, states like Wyoming, Oklahoma, New Mexico and Montana have higher gas taxes than what this bill contains.¶ Other Democrats said that while the 39 cents per MCF may be the highest rate in the country, other taxes on drillers in Pennsylvania, such as income and property taxes, are lower, so the overall tax isn't the highest in the U.S.¶ **Initially, 60 percent of the shale-tax revenue was to go to the state general fund and 40 percent was to be split several ways, including going to county and local governments, environmental improvements and the hazardous sites cleanup fund**. But under an amendment by Rep. Kate Harper, R-Montgomery, that passed Tuesday night, those percentages were reversed, with 40 percent going to the state. She said the original version of the bill didn't provide enough for local government or the Environmental Stewardship Fund in the first year.¶ **Everyone agreed that the bill is far from the final word on the subject of a shale gas tax**. Erik Arneson, an aide to Senate Republican leader Dominic Pileggi, said the 39 cents per MCF "is not an approach that would win majority support in the Senate."¶ But Democrats said Tuesday night's affirmative vote on the amendment at least keeps the process moving forward, with upcoming talks aimed at producing a bill that can pass both chambers and be signed by Gov. Ed Rendell before legislators go home in mid-October.

**A2: Natural Gas Lobby**

**The lobby’s super weak**

**Overby 11/23** Peter is an NPR reporter. “With Little Clout, Natural Gas Lobby Strikes Out,” 2012, http://www.vpr.net/npr/113138252/

There is almost a century's worth of natural gas in shale rock formations all over the country, enough to make a significant change in the debate about America's energy future. But **as Congress moves toward writing a new national energy policy, natural-gas lobbyists have been mostly missing in action.** "Natural gas is the cleanest of the fossil fuels," says Christopher Flavin, president of the Worldwatch Institute, a think tank that does environmental research. "I think nobody's ever argued that. The big thing, of course, that's changed is that shale gas has now opened up as this enormous resource." Natural gas emits half the carbon of coal. Flavin and some other top environmentalists want Congress to embrace natural gas as a transition fuel, to move the country away from coal and toward clean fuels that haven't yet come on the market. A Changing Landscape? "I'm actually hopeful that we will see a change in the whole landscape of the politics around natural gas as a result," Flavin says. But the **change hasn't come yet on Capitol Hill. When the House passed its climate-change bill in June, the big winner was coal**. The measure — called Waxman-Markey for its two lead sponsors, Reps. Henry Waxman (D-CA) and Edward Markey (D-MA) — would give electric utilities longer deadlines to keep burning coal, and would commit millions of federal dollars to research new technologies that would reduce coal's carbon emissions. **Waxman-Markey had no** such **incentives for natural gas, and those in the industry are frustrated.** That's because about a century's worth of natural gas is available in shale formations all over the country. "I know I had many conversations with representatives, trying to tell the natural gas story," says Steven Malcolm, CEO of Williams Companies, a big independent producer of natural gas. "I don't know why **we didn't fare better.** I heard one representative say **there wasn't a critical mass of natural gas represented."** Soon after Waxman-Markey passed, leaders of the natural gas industry met at an annual conference in Denver — where former Sen. Tim Wirth chewed them out. Wirth used to represent Colorado and has long been an advocate of natural gas. Since 1998, he has been president of the United Nations Foundation, a nonprofit organization that works on climate change. Wirth told the industry leaders that on Waxman-Markey, they blew it. "Every industry was deeply engaged, except one: Yours," he said. "The natural gas industry, the industry with the most to gain and the most to offer, was not at the bargaining table." It's an especially harsh verdict because the Waxman-Markey bill was drafted only after high-profile negotiations with proponents of coal, nuclear, oil, wind, solar and other energy sources. What Kept Natural Gas Out? Three things kept natural gas away from that table. First of all: politics. The industry likes Republicans and historically has funneled most of its campaign contributions to the GOP. But now, of course, it's the Democrats who control Congress. The second problem: The natural gas industry has a lot of global-warming skeptics. Fred Julander, president of Julander Energy Co. in Denver, isn't one of them, but he understands their perspective. "They want to be honest brokers," Julander says. "They don't want to take advantage of something they don't believe in, even if it improves their bottom line if it's based on a falsehood — which is, I mean, is in some ways commendable, but in some ways is short-sighted." And **the industry's third problem is size. It's made up mostly of medium to small companies that can't compete on Capitol Hill.**

**Cuba - Oil Investment/Exploration Links**

**Drains PC – Congress wont support, Cuba and environment lobbies hate it, and Oil companies won’t push very hard**

**AP, 6**  (Lubbock Journal Online, 7/30, <http://lubbockonline.com/stories/073006/bus_073006025.shtml>)

In May, **with much fanfare**, Rep. Jeff **Flake**, R-Ariz., **and** Sen. Larry **Craig**, R-Idaho**, introduced** twin **bills to** the House and Senate that would **exempt Big Oil from the embargo**. Before introducing his legislation, Craig told a reporter that "prohibition on trade with Cuba has accomplished just about zero." Ominously, he added: "China, as we speak, has a drilling rig off the coast of Cuba." (The senator failed to mention that the Chinese are working in shallow water near Cuba's shore, and possess neither the technology nor the expertise to tap Cuba's promising deep-water reserves.) Regardless, the bills represent the best chance yet to "punch a big hole into the embargo," says Johannes Werner, editor of Cuba Trade & Investment News, published in Sarasota, Fla. **That scenario raises the hackles of the conservative, and highly influential, Cuban-American voting lobby** of south Florida. **Says** Alfredo **Mesa, executive director of the Cuban American National Foundation** in Miami: **"Those who** would **advocate for** ... allowing U.**S. companies to drill off Cuba lose sight of how that would damage our ability to press the Cuban government on other issues,** such as human rights." **Environmentalists are also squarely set against oil-industry access to Cuba**, though for different reasons. Oil spills - even routine toxic pollution from drilling - could pollute the Everglades and Florida's most economically important beaches, they say, and wreck the state's tourism industry. **Thanks to** **Sen.** Bill **Nelson,** D-Fla., **and** Rep. Jim **Davis**, D-Fla., **they, too, have measures in Congress** for which to cheer: twin bills **that would deny U.S. visas to executives of** foreign **companies that drill for oil in Cuban waters.** Nelson's bill would undo a 1977 maritime boundary agreement between the countries that bisects the Straits of Florida and allows Cuba to perform commercial activities (e.g., oil drilling) near the Florida Keys. **How likely is it that Congress will act?** "If **the oil industry continues to sit on the fence as it has been** - **not too likely**, especially with this administration and Congress," says Werner, editor of the Cuba trade newsletter. "But there are elections in November, which could change the whole equation." All of this is still somewhat premature, says Jorge Pinon, a former senior executive with Amoco Oil and a research associate at the Institute for Cuban and Cuban-American Studies at the University of Miami. "We are still three to five years away from commercializing any of those Cuban reserves."

**Drains PC – energy coop is Cuba lobby’s worst nightmare**

**Voss, 11**

Michael Voss, BBC News, Havana, 11/15/11, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-latin-america-15737573>

**He wants to see the US** co-operate with Cuba on safety issues and **ease the embargo to allow US companies to assist** in case of an emergency. "It is profoundly in the interests of the United States to prepare the Cubans as best we can to ensure that we are protected in the case of a spill. We need to make it 'Key West safe'." **But Florida's powerful Cuban-American lobby has other ideas and** with the 2012 presidential election looming, Barack **Obama is in a difficult position**. Oil windfall? **The anti-Castro groups want the administration to take action to halt the drilling altogether** and not just for safety reasons. **A major oil find would make this** communist-run Caribbean **island financially independent** for the first time since the revolution in 1959. For more than half a century Cuba has been dependent on the largesse of its ideological allies. First it was subsidised by the Soviet Union, then more recently Venezuela and, to a lesser extent, China. Cuba has long produced some oil from a series of small onshore and coastal deposits. Cuba already has a small domestic oil industry Tourists going from Havana to the beach resort of Varadero drive past several kilometres of nodding donkeys and the occasional Chinese or Canadian drilling rig. Cuba currently produces about 53,000 barrels of oil a day but still needs to import about 100,000 barrels, mainly from Venezuela. Its deep territorial waters, though, lie on the same geological strata as oil rich Mexico and the US Gulf. Estimates on just how much offshore oil Cuba is sitting on vary. A US Geological Survey estimate suggests 4.6bn barrels, the Cubans say 20bn. Even the most conservative estimate would make Cuba a net oil exporter. A large find would provide untold riches. **It is one of the** US-based **anti-Castro lobby's worst nightmares**. **"The decaying Cuban regime is desperately reaching out for an economic lifeline, and it appears to have found a willing partner in Repsol to come to its rescue**," Ileana **Ros-Lehtinen**, the Cuban-born Republican and Chairwoman of the influential House Foreign Affairs Committee, **said** in a statement recently. The Florida Congresswoman and a group of **33 other legislators, both Republican and Democrat, wrote to Repsol warning the company** that the drilling could subject the company to "criminal and civil liability in US courts". Repsol responded saying that its exploratory wells complied with all current US legislation covering the embargo as well as all safety regulations. If oil exploration goes well, Cuba could meet its energy needs and become a net exporter It has also agreed to allow US officials to conduct a safety inspection of the Chinese rig before it enters Cuban waters. Under the embargo it is limited to just 10% American technology. The rig was fitted in Singapore and the one piece of US equipment which was installed was the blow-out preventer. It was the failure of BP's blow-out preventer which was at the heart of that disaster. According to Lee Hunt, the Scarabeo 9 is a state of the art deep-water rig and there are six similar platforms built at the same Chinese shipyard currently operating in US waters. For the moment environmental concerns appear to be taking precedence over politics. The government will take up Repsol's offer to inspect Scarabeo 9 and a limited number of licences have been issued to US clean-up operators to enter Cuban waters and assist in the event of a spill. But **the arguments are far from over as environmentalists are pushing for greater co-operation while Cuban-American groups are looking at ways to place legal and legislative hurdles in the way**.

**Massive backlash from anti-castro lobby and congressional forces**

**Eskovitchl, 12**

Joseph Eskovitchl, Columnist @ FRFI, January 2012, http://ratb.org.uk/news/cuba/204-cuban-oil-exploration

**Countering the calls for co-operation, the powerful Cuban-exile lobby in Florida**, a key swing state in next year’s presidential elections, **calls for increased pressure to obstruct drilling operations in Cuban waters.** **Most recently**, on 9 November 2011, **Democrat Senator** Bill **Nelson introduced a bill which would allow claimants to sue foreign companies responsible for any oil spill without limit.** The Financial Times’ John Paul **Rathbone described this as ‘not so much an environmental measure. It’s more of a stick with which to beat Cuba – or rather, as the sponsors admit, to discourage companies from drilling for oil there**’ (22 November 2011). South Florida’s Republican representative to Congress, Illena **Rohs-Lehtinen has introduced three ‘no-drill bills’ this year. These would impose punitive measures against Cuba’s** foreign **oil partners,** including stripping executives of US visas and withholding US drilling concessions. An outspoken supporter of Cuban-exile terrorists, Rohs-Lehtinen is chair of the House of Representatives Committee on Foreign Affairs**. Together with** three **other Cuban-American congressional representatives, she wrote a letter to Obama** at the beginning of November 2011, **stating: ‘we are extremely concerned over** what seems to be **a lack of a co-ordinated effort by the Administration to prevent a State Sponsor of Terrorism**, just 90 miles from our shores, **from engaging in** risky deep sea oil **drilling** projects that will harm US interests.’ Spanish **Repsol,** the first company to lease the Scarabeo and the only private company involved which has significant commercial operations in the United States, **has been pressurised and intimidated. Rohs-Lehtinen and a bipartisan group of 34 representatives wrote directly to Repsol’s chair**man **calling** on him **to ‘reassess the risks inherent in partnering with the Castro dictatorship**, including the risk to its commercial interests with the United States’, **warning** that **the company could face liability in US courts**. **The Obama administration is also applying pressure on Repsol**. In early June, the US Secretary of the Interior, Ken Salazar, leading a delegation of top US government officials, met with Repsol’s general director of exploration and Spain’s Industry Minister. A US State Department press release said the aim was ‘to engage industry and the international community in a dialogue on safe and responsible offshore oil and gas development’. In fact it was to warn Repsol over its partnership with Cuba. In response Repsol agreed to allow the US Coast Guard and the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement to inspect the Scarabeo rig. However, they also insist that the operation complies with all the unilateral US blockade legislation and will continue as planned. **We can expect further pressure to be applied** on Spain since the return of the conservative and historically anti-Cuban Popular Party in general elections on 21 November.

**Lacks congressional support – Cuban oil initiatives failed 8 times last year alone, and even supporters are divided over proper approach**

**Sullivan 13**

Mark P. Sullivan Specialist in Latin American Affairs, Congressional Research Service, 6/12/13, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R43024.pdf

**U.S. oil spill mitigation companies** can be licensed by the Treasury and Commerce Departments to **provide support and equipment in the event of an oil spill.** One such example is a Florida-based company, **Clean Caribbean** & Americas, which **has** had **licenses to be involved in Cuba** since 2001. In addition, the U.S. **Coast Guard has** obtained **licenses** from Treasury and Commerce that allow it “to broadly engage in preparedness and response activities, and positions” the agency “to direct an immediate response in the event of a catastrophic oil spill.”119 **Some** energy and policy analysts, however, **have called** for the Administration **to ease regulatory restrictions on private companies** for the transfer of U.S. equipment and personnel to Cuba needed to prevent and combat a spill if it occurs. **Interest in Cuba’s offshore oil development was strong in the 112th Congress, particularly over concerns about a potential oil spill, with** three congressional hearings held and **eight legislative initiatives introduced taking different approaches, none of which were enacted.** **The various policy approaches included: sanctioning foreign companies investing in or supporting Cuba’s oil development; requiring the Secretary of the Interior to make recommendations on a joint contingency plan** with Mexico, Cuba, and the Bahamas to ensure an adequate response to oil spills; **and authorizing U.S. companies to engage in oil spill prevention and clean-up activities in Cuba**’s offshore oil sector **as well as broader exploration and extraction activities**.

**Cuba - Oil Spills Cleanup Links**

**Coop on spills cleanup and drilling safety triggers MASSIVE cuba lobby backlash**

**Voss, 11**

Michael Voss, BBC News, Havana, 11/15/11, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-latin-america-15737573>

**He wants to see the US co-operate with Cuba on safety issues and ease the embargo to allow US companies to assist in case of an emergency**. "It is profoundly in the interests of the United States to prepare the Cubans as best we can to ensure that we are protected in the case of a **spill**. We need to make it 'Key West safe'." **But Florida's powerful Cuban-American lobby has other ideas and** with the 2012 presidential election looming, Barack **Obama is in a difficult position**. Oil windfall? **The anti-Castro groups want the administration to take action to halt the drilling altogether and not just for safety reasons. A major oil find would make this** communist-run Caribbean **island financially independent** for the first time since the revolution in 1959. For more than half a century Cuba has been dependent on the largesse of its ideological allies. First it was subsidised by the Soviet Union, then more recently Venezuela and, to a lesser extent, China. Cuba has long produced some oil from a series of small onshore and coastal deposits. Cuba already has a small domestic oil industry Tourists going from Havana to the beach resort of Varadero drive past several kilometres of nodding donkeys and the occasional Chinese or Canadian drilling rig. Cuba currently produces about 53,000 barrels of oil a day but still needs to import about 100,000 barrels, mainly from Venezuela. Its deep territorial waters, though, lie on the same geological strata as oil rich Mexico and the US Gulf. Estimates on just how much offshore oil Cuba is sitting on vary. A US Geological Survey estimate suggests 4.6bn barrels, the Cubans say 20bn. Even the most conservative estimate would make Cuba a net oil exporter. A large find would provide untold riches. **It is one of the** US-based **anti-Castro lobby's worst nightmares**. **"The decaying Cuban regime is desperately reaching out for an economic lifeline, and it appears to have found a willing partner in Repsol to come to its rescue**," Ileana **Ros-Lehtinen**, the Cuban-born Republican and Chairwoman of the influential House Foreign Affairs Committee, **said** in a statement recently. The Florida Congresswoman and a group of **33 other legislators, both Republican and Democrat, wrote to Repsol warning the company** that the drilling could subject the company to "criminal and civil liability in US courts". Repsol responded saying that its exploratory wells complied with all current US legislation covering the embargo as well as all safety regulations. If oil exploration goes well, Cuba could meet its energy needs and become a net exporter It has also agreed to allow US officials to conduct a safety inspection of the Chinese rig before it enters Cuban waters. Under the embargo it is limited to just 10% American technology. The rig was fitted in Singapore and the one piece of US equipment which was installed was the blow-out preventer. It was the failure of BP's blow-out preventer which was at the heart of that disaster. According to Lee Hunt, the Scarabeo 9 is a state of the art deep-water rig and there are six similar platforms built at the same Chinese shipyard currently operating in US waters. For the moment environmental concerns appear to be taking precedence over politics. The government will take up Repsol's offer to inspect Scarabeo 9 and a limited number of licences have been issued to US clean-up operators to enter Cuban waters and assist in the event of a spill. But **the arguments are far from over as environmentalists are pushing for greater co-operation while Cuban-American groups are looking at ways to place legal and legislative hurdles in the way**.

**Coop on drilling spills and safety trigger massive backlash from cuba lobby and congressional forces**

**Eskovitchl, 12**

Joseph Eskovitchl, Columnist @ FRFI, January 2012, http://ratb.org.uk/news/cuba/204-cuban-oil-exploration

**The restrictions imposed** by the US blockade **mean that in** the case of **a spill from Cuban waters, the government would have to turn further afield for help** with the resources and experience needed for a clean-up. ‘In the event of a disaster we are talking a response time in terms of equipment of four to six weeks as opposed to 36 or 48 hours. This is a serious impediment’, warned Hunt. Co-operation is vital to avoid such a crisis scenario. **Countering the calls for co-operation, the powerful Cuban-exile lobby in Florida**, a key swing state in next year’s presidential elections, **calls for increased pressure to obstruct drilling operations in Cuban waters.** **Most recently**, on 9 November 2011, **Democrat Senator** Bill **Nelson introduced a bill which would allow claimants to sue foreign companies responsible for any oil spill without limit.** The Financial Times’ John Paul **Rathbone described this as ‘not so much an environmental measure. It’s more of a stick with which to beat Cuba – or rather, as the sponsors admit, to discourage companies from drilling for oil there**’ (22 November 2011). South Florida’s Republican representative to Congress, Illena **Rohs-Lehtinen has introduced three ‘no-drill bills’ this year. These would impose punitive measures against Cuba’s** foreign **oil partners,** including stripping executives of US visas and withholding US drilling concessions. An outspoken supporter of Cuban-exile terrorists, Rohs-Lehtinen is chair of the House of Representatives Committee on Foreign Affairs**. Together with** three **other Cuban-American congressional representatives, she wrote a letter to Obama** at the beginning of November 2011, **stating: ‘we are extremely concerned over** what seems to be **a lack of a co-ordinated effort by the Administration to prevent a State Sponsor of Terrorism**, just 90 miles from our shores, **from engaging in** risky deep sea oil **drilling** projects that will harm US interests.’ Spanish **Repsol,** the first company to lease the Scarabeo and the only private company involved which has significant commercial operations in the United States, **has been pressurised and intimidated. Rohs-Lehtinen and a bipartisan group of 34 representatives wrote directly to Repsol’s chair**man **calling** on him **to ‘reassess the risks inherent in partnering with the Castro dictatorship**, including the risk to its commercial interests with the United States’, **warning** that **the company could face liability in US courts**. **The Obama administration is also applying pressure on Repsol**. In early June, the US Secretary of the Interior, Ken Salazar, leading a delegation of top US government officials, met with Repsol’s general director of exploration and Spain’s Industry Minister. A US State Department press release said the aim was ‘to engage industry and the international community in a dialogue on safe and responsible offshore oil and gas development’. In fact it was to warn Repsol over its partnership with Cuba. In response Repsol agreed to allow the US Coast Guard and the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement to inspect the Scarabeo rig. However, they also insist that the operation complies with all the unilateral US blockade legislation and will continue as planned. **We can expect further pressure to be applied** on Spain since the return of the conservative and historically anti-Cuban Popular Party in general elections on 21 November.

**Anti castro forces PERCEIVE the plan as facilitating drilling efforts, undermining embargo and enriching regime -– even florida drilling opponents prefer more hardline solutions**

**Klimasinska, 11**

Katarzyna Klimasinska Bloomberg News, 12/8/11, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2011-12-08/cuba-oil-drilling-tests-u-s-on-protecting-florida-or-embargo.html>

**The exploration poses** an environmental, **political** and diplomatic **challenge** to the U.S. more than 50 years after cutting off relations with Cuba’s communist regime. **The Obama** administration’s **dilemma is “what steps to take for environmental protection and how much to honor current Cuba policy**,” Dan Whittle, Cuba program director at the New York- based Environmental Defense Fund, said in an interview. In the aftermath of the revolution that brought Fidel Castro to power, the U.S. banned exports to Cuba in 1960, withdrew diplomatic recognition, backed the failed Bay of Pigs invasion in 1961 and imposed a full trade embargo in 1962. Now generations of animosity between the two nations limit cooperation on safety standards and cleanup precautions for the Cuba drilling planned by Madrid-based Repsol, which would be followed by state-owned companies from Malaysia to Venezuela. A conference on regional oil-spill response being held this week in Nassau, Bahamas, may provide a forum for discussions by U.S. and Cuban representatives. Juan Jacomino, a spokesman for the Cuban Interests Section at the Swiss embassy in Washington, declined in an interview to comment on drilling off of the island nation. Spare Parts Repsol can use the Scarabeo 9 without violating the U.S. trade embargo because it was built at shipyards in China and Singapore, and fewer than 10 percent of its components are American, according to its owner, Eni SpA. (ENI) The sanctions would block spare parts from the U.S. for the rig’s blowout preventer, a safety device that failed in the BP spill. The restrictions also require Helix Energy Solutions Group Inc. (HLX) of Houston, which provides oil-spill containment equipment for Repsol in the Gulf of Mexico, to seek a waiver to do so in Cuban waters in case of an accident. U.S. companies seeking to do business with Cuba must ask the Commerce Department, which considers most applications “subject to a policy of denial,” the agency says on its website. The Treasury Department weighs requests to travel from the U.S. to Cuba. **Granting too few permits for spill prevention and response would keep contractors from offering** the **technology** and services **developed after the BP spill**, Lee Hunt, president of the Houston-based International Association of Drilling Contractors, said in an interview. Cuban Exiles **Approving too many licenses would undermine the embargo, enriching a regime listed** by the U.S. State Department **as a nation supporting terrorism** along with Iran, Sudan and Syria, **according to anti-Castro lawmakers such as** Republican Representative Ileana **Ros-Lehtinen** of Florida, who heads the House Foreign Affairs Committee. **U.S. “**assistance, **guidance and technical advice**” to Repsol, including the planned visit to Scarabeo 9, **may violate the law by “helping to facilitate” the company’s work and providing the Cuban government “with a financial windfall,” Ros-Lehtinen said in a** Nov. 1 **letter to** President Barack **Obama.** **Ros-Lehtinen**, who immigrated from Cuba with her family at age 8, **is a leader among Cuban exiles** in South Florida **who have opposed easing U.S. restrictions**. Florida, which has been a swing state in presidential elections, also has been a bastion of opposition to oil drilling that opponents say could despoil the beaches that are a prime draw for tourists. **Florida Drilling Foes** Lawmakers **such as** Senator Bill **Nelson**, a Florida Democrat, have fought to keep drilling out of U.S. waters in the eastern Gulf of Mexico bordering Florida. Nelson **and** Senator Robert **Menendez,** a New Jersey Democrat, **introduced a bill** Nov. 9 **that would require foreign companies drilling in Cuban waters to pay for damage to U.S. territory without liability limits.** Senator Marco **Rubio,** a Florida Republican, **joined as a cosponsor**.

**Congressional anti-castro forces view it as giving credibility to Cuba’s drilling efforts – which they hate – triggers mass backlash**

**Colvin and Stephens, 11**

Sarah Stephens is Executive Director of the Center for Democracy in the Americas. Jake Colvin is Vice President for Global Trade Issues at the National Foreign Trade Council, 9/29/11, <http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/foreign-policy/184661-us-cuba-policy-and-the-race-for-oil-drilling>

Due to the fact that the drilling involves Cuba, **American companies** and workers **cannot lend their expertise** to what could be a risky operation. U.S. economic sanctions prevent our private sector from helping Cuba drill safely and paralyze the U.S. government, which ought to be convening bilateral discussions on best practices and coordinating disaster response. In fact, the U.S. has no emergency response agreement with Cuba for oil spills. While some specific licenses have been granted to permit U.S. firms to conduct limited transactions with Cuba, current sanctions bar the United States from **deploying** the kind of **clean-up** equipment, engineers, spare parts for blow-out prevention, chemical dispersants, and rigs to drill relief wells that would be needed to address an oil crisis involving Cuba. One welcomed development came earlier this month, when William Reilly, a former head of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and co-chair of the Commission that investigated the Deepwater Horizon disaster, led a group of experts to Cuba to take a look at their plans. While the administration has done well giving permission to Mr. Reilly, as well as to other experts, to discuss the problem with Cuban counterparts, it should move more aggressively to work with the Cuban government to cooperate on plans for safe drilling and responding to a possible crisis. **Rather than moving forward**, some in the U.S. **Congress would make the problem worse**. **Rep**. Ileana Ros-**Lehtinen** (FL-R), who **criticized** Mr. **Reilly’s visit to Cuba as “giving credibility to the regime’s dangerous oil-drilling scheme,” has offered legislation to try and stop** Repsol from **drilling**. Rep. Vern Buchanan (FL-R) would deny Repsol the right to drill in U.S. waters if it helped Cuba drill in its waters. **Thirty-four members of both parties have written Repsol directly, threatening the company** if it drills with Cuba. Yet this tactic can’t work. Even if they could deter Repsol from drilling – which is unlikely – they cannot stop Cuba and partners from countries like China, Russia, and Venezuela, from using the rig and searching for oil. At some point, it is likely that drilling will begin and the United States ought to do what it can to prepare for that eventuality. The U.S. government should facilitate access by Cuba and its drilling partners to the resources they need to drill safely. President Obama should instruct the Treasury Department to issue a blanket general license now that would allow private industry to provide what oil expert Jorge Piñon calls ”any conceivable response” in the event of a crisis. As we have already done with Mexico and Canada, the U**.S. should join Cuba in crafting a crisis response** agreement covering on-scene coordinators, a joint response team, response coordination centers, rapid notification protocols, customs and immigration procedures, and communications. The plan should be written, signed, tested, and implemented as quickly as possible. Earlier this year, the Deep Water Horizon Commission, which Mr. Reilly co-chaired, said in its final report “that neither BP nor the federal government was prepared to deal with a spill” of its magnitude or complexity; that industry and policy makers were lulled by a “culture of complacency” that resulted in 5 million barrels of oil being dumped into the Gulf. Having seen this movie once before, complacency is inexcusable. **Politics should not blind Washington to the reality of the situation** unfolding off of our shores.

**Cuba Specific - A2: Oil lobby turn**

**Even if they support it – oil lobby wont push hard – focused on better prospects in other regions**

**Krauss, 12**

Clifford Krauss, Damien Cave, NYT, 11/9/12, http://www.nytimes.com/2012/11/10/world/americas/rigs-departure-to-hamper-cubas-oil-prospects.html?\_r=0

**Cuba’s hopes of** reviving its economy with an **oil boom have produced little more than three dry holes, persuading** foreign **oil companies to remove the** one **deepwater rig** able to work i**n Cuban waters so it could be used for more lucrative prospects elsewhere.** The rig, which was built in China to get around the United States trade embargo, is expected to depart in the next few weeks. With no other rigs available for deepwater exploration, that means Cuba must now postpone what had become an abiding dream: a windfall that would save Cuba’s economy and lead to a uniquely Cuban utopia where the island’s socialist system was paid for by oil sales to its capitalist neighbors. “**The Cuban oil dream is over and done with, at least for the next five years,” said** Jorge **Piñon, a former BP and Amoco executive who** fled Cuba as a child but **continues to brief foreign oil companies on Cuban oil** prospects. “**The companies have better prospects by going to Brazil, Angola and the U.S. Gulf.”** The lack of a quick find comes at a difficult time for Cuba. The effects of Hurricane Sandy, which destroyed more than 100,000 homes in eastern Cuba, are weighing down an economy that remains moribund despite two years of efforts by the Cuban government to cut state payrolls and cautiously encourage free enterprise on a small scale. Cuba had hoped to become energy independent, after relying first on Russia and now on Venezuela for most of its oil. But with its drilling prospects dimming, experts say, Cuban officials may be pushed to accelerate the process of economic opening. At the very least, it may embolden members of the bureaucracy looking for broader or faster changes in the economy. “This could represent a crucial setback for the Cuban regime,” said Blake Clayton, an energy fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations. In the meantime, the government has mostly tried to put a positive spin on the disappointing drilling results and the decision of the rig operator to lease in other waters. Granma, the Communist Party newspaper, reported last week that while Venezuela’s state oil firm had plugged its hole because “it did not offer possibilities of commercial exploitation,” the drilling had obtained valuable geological information. The Venezuelan firm was the last of three foreign oil companies to use the rig, after the Spanish company Repsol and the Malaysian company Petronas. The government said more exploration could be expected. The **potential for Cuba’s oil reserves**, like nearly everything involving Cuba, **has been a matter of dispute**. Cuban officials had predicted that oil companies would find 20 billion barrels of oil reserves off its northern coast. The United States Geological Survey has estimated Cuban oil reserves at 5 billion barrels, one quarter of the Cuban estimate. **The best-case scenario for production**, according to some oil experts, **would be for Cuba to eventually become a medium-size producer** like Ecuador. **But as the three dry holes showed, far more exploration effort would be needed,** and that presents a challenge for a country with limited resources and the hurdle of American sanctions. **There are many offshore areas that are competing with Cuba for the attention of oil companies, particularly off the coasts of South America and East and West Africa**.

**Oil industry has moved on – Cuba isn’t a top priority**

**Gibson, 13**

William E. Gibson, Washington Bureau, Sun Sentinel, 4/14/13, http://articles.sun-sentinel.com/2013-04-14/news/fl-cuban-oil-drilling-retreat-20130414\_1\_jorge-pi-north-coast-cuban-officials

**Companies abandon search for oil in Cuba's deep waters** Threat to Florida's environment reduced as **drillers look elsewhere** After spending nearly $700 million during a decade, **energy companies from around the world have all but abandoned their search for oil in deep waters off** the north coast of **Cuba** near Florida, a blow to the Castro regime but a relief to environmentalists worried about a major oil spill. **Decisions by** Spain-based Repsol and other **companies to drill elsewhere** greatly reduce the chances that a giant slick along the Cuban coast would ride ocean currents to South Florida, threatening its beaches, inlets, mangroves, reefs and multibillion-dollar tourism industry. The Coast Guard remains prepared to contain, skim, burn or disperse a potential slick. And Cuban officials still yearn for a lucrative strike that would prop up its economy. A Russian company, Zarubezhneft, is drilling an exploratory well in shallower waters hugging the Cuban shoreline south of the Bahamas. But though some oil has been found offshore, **exploratory drilling** in deep waters near currents that rush toward Florida has **failed to reveal big deposits that would be commercially viable to extract, discouraging companies from pouring more money into the search**. "**Those companies are saying**, 'We cannot spend any more capital on this high-risk exploration. **We'd rather go to Brazil**; we'd rather go to **Angola;** we'd rather go to **other places in the world where the technological and geological challenges are less**,**'" said** Jorge **Piñon, an oil-industry analyst** at the University of Texas who consults with U.S. and Cuban officials as well as energy companies. "**I don't foresee any time in the future exploration in Cuba**'s deep-water north coast. **It is, for all practical purposes, over."**

**Lack of new oil find means oil industry focused elsewhere and wont lobby hard for the plan**

**Haven, 12**

Paul Haven, Associated Press, 5/27/12, http://thecubaneconomy.com/articles/tag/cuba-venezuela-relations/

But the first **attempt** in nearly a decade **to find Cuba’s** hoped-for undersea **oil bonanza has come up dry**, and the island’s leaders and their partners must regroup and hope they have better luck – quickly. Experts say it is not unusual that a 3-mile (4.8-kilometer) deep exploratory well drilled at a cost of more than $100 million by Spanish oil giant Repsol was a bust. Four out of five such wells find nothing in the high-stakes oil game, and petroleum companies are built to handle the losses. But Cuba has more at stake, and only a few more spins left of the roulette wheel. The enormous Scarabeo-9 platform being used in the hunt is the only one in the world that can drill in Cuban waters without incurring sanctions under the U.S. economic embargo, and it is under contract for only one to four more exploratory wells before it heads off to Brazil. “**If oil is not found now** I think **it would be another five to 10 years before somebody else comes back and drills again,” said** Jorge **Pinon, the former president of Amoco Oil Latin America and a leading expert on Cuba’s energy prospects**. “Not because there is no oil, but because the pain and tribulations that people have to go through to drill in Cuba are not worth it when **there are better and easier options in places like Angola, Brazil or the U.S. Gulf of Mexico.”** A delay would be catastrophic for Cuba, where 80-year-old President Raul Castro is desperately trying to pull the economy out of the doldrums through limited free-market reforms, and has been forced to cut many of the subsidies islanders have come to expect in return for salaries of just $20 a month. It could also leave the Communist-governed island more dependent on Venezuela, where President Hugo Chavez is ailing with cancer. Chavez provides Cuba with $3 billion worth of heavily subsidized oil every year, a deal that might evaporate if he dies or fails to win re-election in October. **An oil find, on the other hand, would potentially improve Cuba’s long-bitter relations with the United States, some analysts suggest. They say the U.S. oil industry could lobby Congress to loosen the embargo** so it could get in on Cuba’s oil game. At the very least, coordination between the Cold War enemies would be necessary to prepare for any spill that could coat beaches in the U.S. and Cuba with black goo.

**Cuba - Oil Spills Cleanup – A2: turns**

**oil industry won’t lobby hard and Environmental groups will push hardline alternatives in attempt to block Cuba drilling altogether**

**AP, 6** (Lubbock Journal Online, 7/30, <http://lubbockonline.com/stories/073006/bus_073006025.shtml>)

**Environmentalists are also squarely set against oil-industry access to Cuba**, though for different reasons. **Oil spills** - even routine toxic pollution from drilling - could pollute the Everglades and Florida's most economically important beaches, they say, and wreck the state's tourism industry. **Thanks to** **Sen.** Bill **Nelson,** D-Fla., **and** Rep. Jim **Davis**, D-Fla., **they, too, have measures in Congress for which to cheer**: twin **bills that would deny U.S. visas to executives of** foreign **companies that drill for oil in Cuban waters. Nelson's bill would undo** a 1977 maritime **boundary agreement** **between the countries that** bisects the Straits of Florida and **allows Cuba to perform commercial activities** (e.g., oil drilling) **near the Florida Keys**. **How likely is it that Congress will act?** "If **the oil industry continues to sit on the fence as it has been** - **not too likely**, especially with this administration and Congress," says Werner, editor of the Cuba trade newsletter. "But there are elections in November, which could change the whole equation." All of this is still somewhat premature, says Jorge Pinon, a former senior executive with Amoco Oil and a research associate at the Institute for Cuban and Cuban-American Studies at the University of Miami. "We are still three to five years away from commercializing any of those Cuban reserves."

**Lacks congressional support – Cuban oil initiatives failed 8 times last year alone, and even supporters are divided over proper approach**

**Sullivan 13**

Mark P. Sullivan Specialist in Latin American Affairs, Congressional Research Service, 6/12/13, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R43024.pdf

**U.S. oil spill mitigation companies** can be licensed by the Treasury and Commerce Departments to **provide support and equipment in the event of an oil spill.** One such example is a Florida-based company, **Clean Caribbean** & Americas, which **has** had **licenses to be involved in Cuba** since 2001. In addition, the U.S. **Coast Guard has** obtained **licenses** from Treasury and Commerce that allow it “to broadly engage in preparedness and response activities, and positions” the agency “to direct an immediate response in the event of a catastrophic oil spill.”119 **Some** energy and policy analysts, however, **have called** for the Administration **to ease regulatory restrictions on private companies** for the transfer of U.S. equipment and personnel to Cuba needed to prevent and combat a spill if it occurs. **Interest in Cuba’s offshore oil development was strong in the 112th Congress, particularly over concerns about a potential oil spill, with** three congressional hearings held and **eight legislative initiatives introduced taking different approaches, none of which were enacted.** **The various policy approaches included: sanctioning foreign companies investing in or supporting Cuba’s oil development; requiring the Secretary of the Interior to make recommendations on a joint contingency plan** with Mexico, Cuba, and the Bahamas to ensure an adequate response to oil spills; **and authorizing U.S. companies to engage in oil spill prevention and clean-up activities in Cuba**’s offshore oil sector **as well as broader exploration and extraction activities**.

**Mexico Oil Link**

**Mexico Energy Cooperation causes controversial amendment attempts and political fights on unrelated issues**

**CFR Senior Staff Oversight Report, 12**

Committee Foreign Relations Oversight Study, Senator Richard G. Lugar, Ranking Member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, requested senior professional staff members to review opportunities for enhanced U.S.-Mexico engagement on oil and gas issues including the U.S.-Mexico Transboundary Agreement, which requires Congressional action to take effect. As part of that review, members of Senator Lugar's staff traveled to Mexico City in October 2012 to meet with then President-elect Enrique Pena Nieto's transition team and leaders from the Mexican Congress, PEMEX, the Mexican energy regulator Comision Nacional de Hidrocarburos, U.S. industry, academic specialists, and U.S. officials at Embassy Mexico City.\1\ This report contains their public findings and Recommendations, 12/21, http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CPRT-112SPRT77567/html/CPRT-112SPRT77567.htm

**The Transboundary Agreement** (TBA) **provides** a bilateral **basis upon which both countries can develop the legal framework necessary for joint production of oil and** natural **gas** reserves that extend across our national maritime borders in the Gulf of Mexico. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and Mexican Minister of Foreign Affairs Patricia Espinosa Cantellano signed the Transboundary Agreement (TBA), officially called the Agreement between the United States of America and the United Mexican States Concerning Transboundary Hydrocarbon Reservoirs in the Gulf of Mexico, on February 20, 2012, at Los Cabos, Mexico (see Appendix I for the text of the agreement). The Mexican Senate ratified the agreement on April 12, 2012, but the Obama administration has not formally submitted the agreement for passage in the U.S. Congress. The TBA was negotiated pursuant to the 2000 Treaty on the Continental Shelf, which called for the U.S. and Mexico to establish a mechanism that transboundary oil and gas reserves would be shared equitably. At the time, concern that companies would drain Mexican reserves from the U.S. side of the border was, reportedly, a hot button political issue in Mexico. Upon conclusion of the 2000 Treaty, the U.S. put a moratorium on oil and gas exploration on the U.S. side of the maritime border. It is widely acknowledged in both capitals that the TBA negotiations moved quickly in order to be completed in time for the ratification in Mexico prior to 2012 Congressional elections. Both PAN and PRI political leaders used their influence to gain support for the TBA, which the Mexican Senate ratified. In the United States, the TBA stalled within the Obama administration despite support by key officials in the Departments of State and Interior. Prior to completing the agreement, the Departments of State and Interior participated in Senate Foreign Relations Committee briefings to discuss status of the negotiations; however, there was no consultation on specific text. The SFRC Minority Staff appreciated candid assessments offered by lead U.S. negotiator Ambassador Richard Morningstar. The Obama administration has not taken a position on the key question of whether the TBA is a treaty or an executive agreement, although the latter seems the administration's more likely preference. A treaty would be reviewed by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and require the advice and consent of the Senate, demanding a two-thirds vote, for approval. As part of the treaty process, the resolution of ratification would be reviewed and amended in order to provide Congressional understandings on issues left unclear by the text of the TBA itself. Additional implementing legislation affecting the Department of Interior would also be required and need review by its committees of oversight. An executive agreement would not require the two-thirds vote necessitated by a treaty, but instead it would be approved in the same form as a statute, requiring passage by majority in both the Senate and the House of Representatives. **Legislation approving the agreement, necessary implementing authorities, and clarifications regarding certain provisions of the TBA could be subject to amendment, including by items unrelated to the TBA itself, thus possibly miring the TBA in other political fights.**

**Venezuela links– Appeasement/Cuba lobby**

**Congress and GOP backlash and media spin ensure new support for Venezuela oil perceived as appeasement, weak on security and soft on Castro– also a flip flop -**

**Robertson, 12**

Ewan Robertson, 4/11/12, Latin America Bureau analyst @ Venezuala Analysis, http://venezuelanalysis.com/analysis/6916

**As both countries head toward** important presidential **elections** this year, the United States has been intensifying its interventionist policy in Venezuela. However, **US attempts to influence Venezuela**’s domestic politics while **casting it a “rogue state”** on an international level, is leaving the Obama administration increasingly out-of-sync with Latin America’s new political reality. US Intervention in Venezuela Since the election of President Hugo Chávez in 1998, US policy has aimed at removing the Venezuelan president from power and ending the Bolivarian Revolution which he leads. This policy has included support by the Bush presidency for the short-lived April 2002 coup in Venezuela, which failed after mass protests returned Chávez to power. Since then the US has focused on nurturing Venezuela’s conservative opposition, channelling over US$100 million to groups opposed to Chávez since 2002. Meanwhile **Washington and US** corporate mass **media have attempted to de-legitimise** his **government internationally** in a propaganda campaign, **portraying Venezuela as a threat** to the US and its president as a “dangerous dictator” who has trampled upon democracy and human rights. Any hopes that the **Obama** administration would usher a new era of respect for Venezuelan sovereignty have long been dashed, with intervention intensifying as Venezuela’s October 7th presidential election draws closer and Chavez seeks his third term in office. In the last twelve months the US government has **imposed sanctions on Venezuela’s** state **oil company** PDVSA for trading with Iran, **expelled the Venezuelan consul** in Miami based on a suspect documentary **implicating the Venezuelan diplomat in plotting a cyber-attack against the US, and publicly criticised the appointment of Venezuela’s new Defence Minister** Henry Rangel Silva. While direct **US actions have maintained a constant rhythm of pressure against Venezuela**, Washington’s hopes of removing Chávez from power undoubtedly lie in the possibility of the conservative Democratic Unity Table (MUD) opposition coalition defeating Chávez in this year’s presidential election. According to investigative journalist Eva Golinger, the US is providing the opposition in Venezuela with political advice and financial support to the tune of US$20 million $20 million this year. This funding for anti-Chávez groups comes from the US national budget, State Department-linked agencies, the National Endowment for Democracy (NED) and USAID, along with the US Embassy in Caracas. A curious detail suggests that the US Embassy has become a key conduit for the distribution of this money. While the Embassy currently only maintains a Charge D’Affairs responsible for diplomatic operations, and overall staff levels remain unchanged, the Embassy budget jumped from almost $16 million in 2011 to over $24 million for 2012, an unexplained increase of over $8 million. Washington has long worked to see the development of a united Venezuelan opposition capable of defeating Chávez. With the current MUD coalition displaying relative unity behind opposition presidential candidate Henrique Capriles Radonski, and the still popular Chávez currently undergoing treatment for cancer, the US is likely hoping 2012 is the year to see an end to Chávez’s administration. Indeed, the make-up of Venezuela’s opposition reads like a “who’s who” of figures who have received advice and financial support from US sources over the previous decade. Several of those who ran in the opposition’s February primary elections to elect the MUD presidential candidate have ties with US financial aid, including the winner Radonski. His political party Primero Justicia has been a key recipient of funding and political training since its founding in 1999, which has helped it to grow into a national force. US funding has also followed fellow primaries candidate Leopoldo López throughout his political career, first in Primero Justicia, then in Un Nuevo Tiempo from 2002, before receiving NED and USAID funding to support his own organisation Voluntad Popular. MUD National Assembly deputy and primaries candidate Maria Machado Corina has also received heavy US financial support, as well as holding a private meeting with George W Bush in 2004. Machado has recently been appointed as a coordinator for Radonski’s “Tricolour Command” presidential election campaign, while Leopoldo López is now a member of the Radonski campaign’s select Political Strategic Command. The Political Strategic Command is headed by experienced opposition figure Professor Ramón Guillermo Aveledo, who with his close political colleagues “assists US sponsors in pouring money into the MUD,” according to analyst Nil Nikandrov. The importance of US funding in helping to shape the current Venezuelan opposition should not be underestimated. Indeed, according to US Embassy cables released by Wikileaks, in 2009 US Embassy chargé d’affaires John Caulfield argued for increased US funding of opposition groups, as “without our continued assistance, it is possible that the organizations we helped create ... could be forced to close...Our funding will provide those organizations a much-needed lifeline”. Another aspect of **Washington’s approach to Venezuela** moving into 2012 **has been the increase of aggressive rhetoric designed to de-legitimise the government** and open the possibility of more direct intervention. At a special Organisation of American States (OAS) session held in Washington in March, **Democrat Congressman** Eliot E**ngel said Venezuelan democracy was being “trampled**” by the Chávez administration **and advocated a “robust” OAS** **mission** be sent to the country to monitor the October presidential elections. **Not to be outdone by their Democratic counterparts, Republicans have continued to wind up the rhetorical dial on Venezuela**. In a presidential nomination debate in Florida this January, Mitt Romney **made a commitment to “punish those** who are **following”** Hugo **Chávez and his ally** Fidel **Castro,** ex-president of Cuba. **He claims that Obama has “failed to respond with resolve”** to Chávez’s growing international influence, **arguing** in his October 2011 foreign policy white paper foreign policy white paper that he would “chart **a different course” in US policy toward Venezuela** **and other leftist governments in Latin America.** Of course, US foreign policy has nothing to do with concern for democracy nor fabrications that Venezuela is involved in plotting an attack against the US.

**Nationalized oil industries and joint development initiatives ensure support can’t avoid appeasement backlash as soft on Venezuela regime, national security, Cuba and terrorism**

**Robertson, 12**

Ewan Robertson, 4/11/12, Latin America Bureau analyst @ Venezuala Analysis, http://venezuelanalysis.com/analysis/6916

Venezuela is one of the region’s most vibrant democracies, witnessing a huge increase in political participation in the previous decade, both in internationally-certified free and fair elections and in new grassroots forms, such as the thousands of communal councils which have sprung up around the country. **Figures in Washington routinely ignore the facts** and the evidence **regarding Venezuela**, for example never mentioning the Chilean-based Latinobarometro regional poll in which Venezuelan citizens regularly demonstrate they have one of the highest levels of support for democracy, and satisfaction with how their democracy works in practice, in Latin America. Rather, **the issue for policy makers in Washington** is that since the arrival of Chávez **Venezuela has refused to play its** designated **role** within US imperial strategy. That is, to offer a reliable supply of cheap oil controlled by US companies, to act as a market for US-based private foreign investment, and to conduct itself as a submissive ally in US diplomacy. It is the Chávez administration’s **policies of national control over oil** and using the resource to fund social programmes, **nationalising strategically important industries, and vocally opposing US foreign policy** while pursuing regional integration on principles contrary to “free trade” that **have made Venezuela a “problem” for US foreign policy.** The Regional Dynamic **One of the** Chávez’s administration’s **key regional** integration **initiatives is the** Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America (**ALBA), established by Cuba and Venezuela** in 2004 **as an alternative to US free trade agreements** by **emphasising mutual solidarity and joint development** between member states. The group now contains eight members in Latin America and the Caribbean. Venezuela has also reached out to the Caribbean **with the Petrocaribe initiative, in which Venezuela sells oil at preferential rates to participating nations** to support their development, with 18 Caribbean states now participating. **The US has responded by trying to isolate Venezuela** and discredit the ALBA. **Romney** has **described it as a “virulently anti-American** ‘Bolivarian’ **movement across Latin America that seeks to undermine** institutions of **democratic governance** and economic opportunity”. Meanwhile, **Council of Foreign Relations** analyst Joe Hirst rather fancifully **tried to paint the organisation**’s inclusion of social movements **as a mechanism for promoting international terrorism**, using information from the long-discredited Farc laptops . **The US has** also **applied diplomatic pressure to discourage other states from strengthening ties with Venezuela.** These have included using intimidation and diplomatic manoeuvres to try to prevent an alliance between Nicaragua and Venezuela after the 2006 election of leftist Daniel Ortega to the Nicaraguan presidency, and **using threats and pressure against Haiti** in 2006-7 **to scupper the** Préval government’s **plan to join Petrocaribe**. This strategy failed, with Nicaragua joining the ALBA at Ortega’s inauguration in early 2007 and the first Petrocaribe oil shipment reaching Haiti in March 2008. The US’s interventionist policy toward Venezuela and the ALBA has instead left it looking ever more isolated in the hemisphere. For example, **the State Department’s sanctions against PDVSA** last May **were collectively rejected by the ALBA, Petrocaribe**, and the Union of South American Nations (UNASUR). The regional reaction to Cuba’s exclusion from the upcoming Summit of the Americas as a result of US opposition repeats this pattern, with the ALBA countries vocally backing Cuba’s future inclusion in such summits. **The US is increasingly out of touch with** the **Latin America’s** new **political reality**, as even the smaller Caribbean states and nations friendly to the US are joining the region’s new mechanisms of integration. Within this dynamic, the results of the October presidential election in Venezuela will be decisive for both the future of the country’s Bolivarian Revolution and the continued development of Latin America and the Caribbean’s new regional organisations, **most of all the ALBA and Petrocaribe**.

**Venezuela Specific - A2: Oil Lobby Turn**

**US Oil industry wont lobby hard – awful past experience and better alternatives make them reluctant to get involved**

**Ladislaw and Verrastro, 13**

Sarah O. Ladislaw, co-director and senior fellow in the CSIS Energy and National Security Program Frank A. Verrastro, senior vice president and holds the James R. Schlesinger Chair for Energy and Geopolitics at CSIS. From 2003 to 2012, he served as director of the CSIS Energy and National Security Program, CSIS, 3/6/13, <http://csis.org/publication/post-chavez-outlook-venezuelan-oil-production>

**Even under the best** of **circumstances, reform in the energy sector will take a long time** to emerge. The damage that has been done to not only PDVSA but to the institutions of the state and civil society could take years to rehabilitate. A few key reasons for this include: revenue from the oil and gas sector that is diverted for political purposes and not reinvested in a way that will drive new production will be hard to direct back to useful investment in the sector, **much of the private sector has been driven away from investment in Venezuela and may be reluctant to return,** **or** for the companies in country to **re-invest in the short-term given their experience in the 2000s,** **oil field mismanagement and damage may have likely occurred** over the last decade and it will take time and investment to revitalize, **many of Venezuela’s core assets are in technologically complex and capital-intensive heavy oil projects that take time and resources to develop and must now be viewed in light of the global array of upstream options that are now on the table for international oil investors** as compared to a decade ago, some of Venezuela’s current commercial relationships on the upstream or export side may have to be revisited in light of a more commercially-based hydrocarbon policy, Venezuela’s energy sector is dominated by the state’s decisions and management and it will take time to replace the managerial competency that once existed, highly subsidized oil is a key feature of Venezuelan society and the political will to reform the entire energy sector into one that is more market-based and open to private investment will necessarily have to feed into the domestic demand-side of that equation. What about Venezuela’s relationship with the United States? Over the last ten years the sustained trading relationship between the United States and Venezuela has been one of the stabilizing forces in an otherwise contentious and sometimes volatile relationship. U.S. refineries in the Gulf Coast are specifically designed to process Venezuela’s sour and medium to heavy crude and serves as its natural market. Despite oil production being down, the United States still imports just under a million barrels of crude per day from Venezuela (down from a peak of 1.4 mmbd in 1997) and, as stated earlier, the government of Venezuela is highly dependent on those revenues for their ongoing stability, especially as revenue from other exports and domestic consumption decline. As we look ahead to another period of transition in Venezuela it is important to be mindful of the potential for disruption and to look for ways to mitigate the impacts of such disruption, but it is equally important to remember the trade ties that bind the two countries for the time being and to find opportunities to drive change in a positive direction. Time may be limited in this regard because the **U.S. domestic production outlook is changing thanks to tight oil development in the United States and the influx of Canadian oil sands, both of which are giving U.S. refiners more options in terms of the crudes they use and more decisions to make about how they want to configure their refineries** going forward. A future in which Venezuela is no longer as competitive in its natural market in the United States would change the outlook for Venezuelan crude marketing decisions.

**US Oil companies reluctant to get involved**

**Gonzalez, 13**

Angel Gonzalez and Kejal Vyas, runs real-time coverage of the U.S. energy industry for Dow Jones & Co.'s financial newswire and columnist for The Wall Street Journal, Columnist for wsj, Wall Street Journal, 3/6/13, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887324128504578344612480601482.html

Venezuela's battered oil industry bore the burden of Hugo Chávez's socialist dream. Now the charismatic leader's death gives his successors the opportunity to unlock its potential, but **few in the oil industry expect** an immediate **renaissance**. Under Mr. Chávez's rule, a huge oil-sector strike, the firing of thousands of top engineers, poor maintenance, frequent refinery accidents and the diversion of oil revenue into social programs and subsidies to foreign allies crippled Petróleos de Venezuela SA, the national oil company. Despite arguably having the world's largest oil reserves, Venezuela's oil output fell by nearly a third to about 2.5 million barrels—about a quarter of Saudi Arabia's output—a day since Mr. Chávez took over 14 years ago, according to the U.S. Energy Information Administration. PDVSA, as the oil company is known, maintains it produces closer to three million barrels a day. **A toughening stance on foreign companies** through Chávez's presidency also **pushed Exxon** Mobil Corp**. and ConocoPhillips out of the country** in 2007 **and prompted other oil firms that remained to invest little.** But **the country's oil policy is unlikely to change in the short term, Venezuelan officials and analysts say,** as Mr. Chávez's likely successors from the ruling United Socialist Party of Venezuela are expected to build their political power base on the so-called Bolivarian Revolution that widened government intervention across most economic sectors. "The oil is for the people, this is a principle that is fixed into our national consciousness," Rafael Ramírez, the country's oil minister, said Tuesday night on state TV after the government announced Mr. Chávez´s death. Mr. Ramírez added that PDVSA would keep sailing the course set by Mr. Chávez, maintaining its focus on social programs and a firm grip on the nation's vast oil reserves. But declining oil output and rising shale-oil production in the U.S., Venezuela's main market, may force a redirection. Barring any new political or military shocks in the Middle East, global oil prices look like "a balloon with a slow leak," said Amy Myers Jaffe, executive director for energy and sustainability at the University of California-Davis. The Venezuelan government can't count on high oil prices to match rising public spending, she added. Anticapitalist rhetoric heated up in the days leading to Mr. Chávez's death. Last week, Venezuelan Acting **President** Nicolás **Maduro accused Chevron** Corp., CVX +0.25% **the No. 2 U.S. oil company** by market value behind Exxon, **of aggression against Ecuador** in a multibillion-dollar environmental lawsuit pitting the company against Ecuadorean plaintiffs.

**Oil companies just aren’t that interested**

**Epperson, 13**

Sharon Epperson and Patti Domm, columnists @ CNBC.com, Christian Science Monitor, 3/6/13, <http://www.csmonitor.com/Environment/Latest-News-Wires/2013/0306/With-Hugo-Chavez-gone-US-oil-industry-eyes-Venezuela>

The **nationalization of Venezuela's oil industry** in 2007 **resulted in the exit of** those two **companies** who were **unable to reach a new agreement with the state-owned oil company** PDVSA. Too Early to Tell "It's too early to tell how the new leader will handle it, but ConocoPhillips could benefit the most," said Fadel Gheit, senior oil analyst at Oppenheimer & Co. **ConocoPhillips** was the biggest foreign stakeholder in Venezuela at the time of nationalization and **could benefit** greatly from regaining its former assets, Gheit said, adding: "The book value of assets that were confiscated was $4.5 billion (at the time.) The market value is now $20 to $30 billion... ConocoPhillips could eventually see a net gain of $10 billion." **But that assumes ConocoPhillips would want to return to the country.** **Venezuela's economic problems extend beyond the oil business. "It really much depends on what kind of government will follow Chavez," said** Enrique **Sira, IHS senior research director for Latin America**. "**The only thing for sure is the fact that the industry is in very poor condition** -- **upstream, downstream, power, and distribution.** Electricity has to be rationed. It has a gas deficit that's been running for years and the country doesn't produce anywhere near what it could produce," Sira said. (Read More: Venezuela Vote, Post-Chavez, Next Risk for Oil) **ConocoPhillips CEO** Ryan Lance, who spoke Tuesday morning at the Houston energy conference prior to news of Chavez's death, **noted how the global energy landscape has changed dramatically. "The new landscape is like someone picked up the energy world and tilted it,**" he said, as **countries with great demand for energy and those with ample supplies has changed. The U.S. is now exporting more of its natural resources than ever before,** he said. Those exports include shipping record supplies of US gasoline to Venezuela. **Meanwhile Venezuela oil exports to the U.S. are on the decline**. Sira said **Venezuela could produce as much as 6 to 9 million barrels of oil a day but now it's probably less than 2.5 million barrels**. He said oil production peaked in the early year at 3.3 million barrels. (Read More: Why Venezuela's World-Beating Oil Reserves Are 'Irrelevant') Venezuela ranked fourth in oil imports to the U.S. last year at 906,000 barrels per day, according to the U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA). But crude oil imports from Venezuela have been declining steadily since 2004, when they peaked at 1.3 million barrels per day. Venezuela's refineries are also in such poor shape that it has to import gasoline and diesel from the U.S. In December, Venezuela imported a record 197,000 barrels per day of petroleum products from the U.S., according to EIA data.

**Even if they like it plans not a high priority for US oil - Nationalized industry, anti-Americanism, hostile tax system**

**Alic, 13**

Jen Alic of Oilprice.com, 4/21/13, <http://www.mining.com/web/foreign-oil-and-gas-companies-look-to-status-quo-in-venezuela/>

**Foreign oil and gas companies look to status quo in Venezuela Now that** Nicolas **Maduro**—the late Hugo **Chavez’s choice for successor**—has narrowly **won** Sunday’s presidential **elections in Venezuela, oil and gas investors can expect a perpetuation of the status quo**. In Sunday’s vote, **Maduro won with** a very narrow 50.7% and **a vow to continue with Chavez’s “revolution,” which has seen the oil industry nationalized and** the state-run PDVSA oil company funding social programs and **voraciously courting China and Russia.** The narrow vote will not be without its challenges. Opposition rival candidate Henrique Capriles has refused to recognize the results and is demanding a recount, though the electoral commission is standing firm on Maduro’s victory. **For foreign oil and gas companies, we can expect more of the same. There are no regulatory changes in the works, and an unattractive windfall tax system** announced in January **will likely be pushed forward** under Maduro. What Maduro is inheriting, though, is a nightmare situation that will see him stuck between using PDVSA to fund expensive social programs that cost it $44 billion last year alone diverted from oil revenues, and cutting social spending or allowing a rise in the price of fuel that could spark regime-threatening unrest. If Maduro feels compelled to reduce fuel subsidies, it could lead to riots as cheap fuel—which cannot be sustained—is one of the most crucial social benefits for Venezuelans, who pay around 6 cents per gallon. **Maduro** has inherited a “sinking ship” **and does not appear to have the political capital to make any short-term changes in Venezuela’s energy policy,** **experts** at Southern Pulse **told** Oilprice.com. “The main energy issue for Venezuela is that oil production is struggling, down from a peak of about 3.2 million barrels per day in 1998 to less than 2.8 million bpd now. One would hope that fixing infrastructure, completing refinery repairs and construction, and investing in exploration and new technology would be priorities but Maduro will not have funds to invest unless he makes controversial cuts to social programs,” according to Southern Pulse, which does not believe that Maduro will attempt to cut fuel subsidies any time soon. A top priority for Maduro will be boosting refining capacity, says Southern Pulse. Towards this end, Maduro may be willing to negotiate if a partner steps forward to build a new refinery, which is a goal Chavez failed to realize. “If PDVSA fails to increase production, PDVSA President Rafael Ramirez may be replaced this year. One way for Maduro to keep his presidency afloat is to bring new proven wells online in the Orinoco Belt; but that will require major investment. PDVSA may need more than a minority-partner-with-a-service-contract at those fields if they want to start pumping soon.” In the meantime, China’s foothold in Venezuela remains on solid ground. China is already privy to 600,000 bpd from Venezuela in return for $42 billion in loans. Maduro is not likely to rock this boat with Beijing, and according to the terms already in place, Venezuelan exports are set to increase to one million bpd by 2015, though most of the loan money has already been spent. According to Southern Pulse, **Maduro will likely seek new loans from China**, but this will depend on the terms and stability in Venezuela. **If this doesn’t work, Maduro will** have to **look** elsewhere—**first to Russia and then perhaps to** US **Chevron** or Spanish Repsol, **the latter** two **having only limited operations in the country**. **Overall, we should consider that Maduro will pursue all-out chavismo. “As president, Maduro will govern as he thinks Chavez himself would have ruled.** However, Maduro probably will not begin pandering to the most radical elements of his party, PSUV, because he has little to gain from that. Maduro is not blind to the myriad problems facing the next president such as blackouts, food shortages and rampant criminal violence,” according to Southern Pulse. While **it’s status quo for now for the oil and gas industry**, it’s clearly bad news for Maduro. “Despite Chavez’s immense popularity, his memory will fade. And with time citizens who loved Chavez will blame Maduro for their struggles,” experts at Southern Pulse say. “If Maduro survives that long, the next election in 2018 will involve a much deeper conversation about the direction of the country.” “In fact, some think that one reason former military leader and current National Assembly Diosdado Cabello—a Chavez loyalist–did not dispute Maduro’s succession is precisely because of the precarious financial and political situation he would have inherited.”

**Not key issue for oil industry - Domestic boom and declining importance of Venezuelan Oil**

**Jegarajah, 13**

Sri Jegarajah, Market Reporter, CNBC Asia Pacific, 3/5/13, http://www.cnbc.com/id/100520892

Meanwhile, a former executive at PDVSA told CNBC that **Venezuela has lost its ability to influence global oil markets** because years of under investment in the OPEC (Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries) member's petroleum industry has constrained production. "**Venezuela is a weak OPEC hawk, as it has no sufficient production to influence prices," said** Gustavo **Coronel, a founding member of** the board of **state-oil firm** Petroleos de Venezuela. "**Venezuela is no longer a factor** that can really upset the markets **as it was the case 20 years ago**." Furthermore, **the energy boom in the U.S. has helped cut dependence of Venezuelan net crude and oil products and exports to the U.S. have dropped to levels last seen nearly 30 years ago. "The U.S. would not miss Venezuelan oil very much," Coronel said**. "Whatever disruption would be almost entirely psychologically induced."

## Internal Links

### Internal Link – Obama Push Key to Bipart

#### Obama will be pushing Republicans to pass immigration reform; strategy must be bipartisan in nature

NICHOLAS 7/7/13 (PETER, “President to Pressure House GOP on Immigration Bill

Plan Includes Visits to Battleground States With Robust Latino Vote”, The Wall Street Journal

July 7, 2013, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887324867904578592032121418230.html?mod=WSJ\_WSJ\_US\_News\_6

President Barack Obama plans to mount a more visible effort to push through an immigration overhaul that is heading toward an uncertain fate in the Republican-controlled House, marking a risky shift from the largely hands-off approach he has employed to date.¶ Mr. Obama likely will travel in the coming months to some of the battleground states he won with the help of a robust Latino vote—possibly including Nevada, New Mexico, Colorado and Florida—to argue the economic case for passing the immigration overhaul. He will also try to convince reticent Republican lawmakers that the GOP's viability as a national party with aspirations of winning back the White House is linked to the fate of the bill, White House officials said.¶ More¶ Turning Permanent Residents Into Citizens¶ Some Republicans, including former Florida Gov. Jeb Bush, have made a similar argument, citing the GOP's need to listen to the growing Latino vote. But many GOP House members who are focused on their own re-election prospects may be unmoved by arguments about what's needed to win back the White House in 2016. Their bigger concern may be potential primary challenges from the right, coupled with genuine misgivings about the legislation.¶ Mr. Obama's strategy carries personal risks as well. Should he take on a partisan tone, he may antagonize House Republicans and scuttle a bill that is the centerpiece of his second-term agenda, feeding perceptions that he is a lame duck.¶ On immigration, Mr. Obama played a largely behind-the-scenes role as the bill worked its way through the Senate, with his aides providing technical assistance and giving quiet advice to lawmakers. With the action moving to the House, the White House is devising a new strategy to push the bill through a chamber that is more resistant to the prospect of a path to citizenship for the 11 million people living in the U.S. illegally.¶ House Speaker John Boehner (R., Ohio) has said he won't let a bill come to a vote unless it has the support of a majority of Republican members—a difficult standard to meet. He will meet with fellow Republican House members on July 10 to develop a "path forward" on immigration, an aide said.¶ As he travels to presidential swing states, Mr. Obama won't attempt to pressure particular House members, but rather underscore the point that the GOP must improve its standing among Latino voters if it hopes to win presidential races down the road, White House officials said.¶ He will go to "areas that Republicans hope to do better in and need to do better in," one White House official said.¶ Another of Mr. Obama's imperatives is ensuring the momentum created by the Senate's solid bipartisan vote doesn't fade, White House officials said. To that end, the White House is enlisting business leaders in hopes of persuading House Republicans to back the bill. Last Tuesday, White House Chief of Staff Denis McDonough met privately with the American Bankers Association, the National Retail Federation, the Financial Services Forum and other business trade groups, to discuss ways to advance the bill.¶ In his travels, Mr. Obama will need to calibrate his message so as not to drive off potential GOP votes. Republicans warn that Mr. Obama could damage the bill's chances if he paints Republicans as heartless obstructionists determined to keep undocumented immigrants in legal limbo.¶ Rep. Peter King (R., N.Y.) said in an interview, "If he's going to say that anyone who doesn't favor this bill is bigoted or biased, it's not going to get anywhere. It's just going to build up resistance. You can legitimately say you shouldn't be giving legal status to 11 million people who violated the law."¶ The White House insisted the president won't make the argument in such terms, but instead point to the economic benefits of giving citizenship to entrepreneurial immigrants, Obama aides said.¶ Mr. Obama is under pressure from his base not to worry excessively about Republican sensibilities. Democratic campaign operatives are eager to use the immigration issue as a cudgel against Republicans in the 2014 midterm elections if the bill fails.¶ Rep. Steve Israel (D., N.Y.), chairman of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, released a memo last month singling out 23 House Republicans who might be amenable to arguments that the immigration bill should pass. In each district, Mr. Obama fared well in the 2012 election, capturing between 46% and 58% of the vote, the memo shows.¶ Should the immigration bill collapse in the House, "then we raise holy hell," one national Democratic campaign official said.¶ Still, Democratic campaign officials recognize that traditional campaign tactics may not prove effective in this instance, given that so many Republicans are comfortably ensconced in safe seats.¶ In the end, the bill's fate hinges on Mr. Boehner's willingness to permit a vote on the bill even if it is clear a majority of House Republicans oppose passage, they said. Support from a minority of House Republicans and strong Democratic backing could provide enough votes to pass a bill, even though the GOP controls the chamber.¶ Sen. Richard Durbin (D., Ill.), a member of the bipartisan group of eight senators who pushed the immigration bill through the Senate, said he worries House members are sometimes too insulated from national issues. "But I think the national party understands the importance of this, and they can appeal to Republican members of the House," he said.

### Internal Link – Bipart Key

#### Bipart is key

Sullivan 6/13/13 (Sean, “What the immigration debate will say about compromise in Washington”, http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/wp/2013/06/13/what-the-immigration-debate-will-say-about-compromise-in-washington/)

Looking for an instance of bipartisanship in Washington? President Obama has one: Congress’s immigration reform effort.¶ “That’s an example of what we can accomplish when we work on a bipartisan basis,” Obama said Wednesday night at a Democratic National Committee fundraiser in Miami.¶ In one sense, he’s right. A bipartisan “Gang of Eight” crafted a bill that has made it to the Senate floor with the potential to win votes from Republicans and Democrats. But viewed another way, the most crucial tests of just how bipartisan the reform effort is are only just beginning.¶ When lawmakers in both parties are willing to step up and help shepherd bipartisan legislation, it’s only part of the battle in Congress. For evidence of this, consider the recent gun control debate.¶ Advocates of stricter gun laws got what they wanted when Sens. Pat Toomey (R-Pa.) and Joe Manchin (D-W.Va.) stepped forward with an amendment to expand background checks. A Republican sponsor? Check. A Democrat with a strong gun-rights record? Check.¶ Still, the measure failed to win passage. It was a reminder that the most important tests of compromise and bipartisanship come when the final votes are tallied on the House and Senate floors.¶ And when it comes to immigration reform, it’s still not clear what those final tallies will read. Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.), who is in the “Gang of Eight,” has warned that the measure needs tighter border security measures. Even moderate Republican Sen. Mark Kirk of Illinois says he won’t support the package without a stronger security component.¶ Meanwhile, adding too many amendments favored by conservatives could upset Democrats and damage the delicate balancing act the “Gang of Eight” has cultivated for months. And even if the bill passes the Senate, the Republican-controlled House remains a question mark.¶ For his part, Obama — who has reinserted himself into the conversation after taking a hands-off approach for months — was bullish Wednesday that comprehensive reform can win passage soon.¶ “I actually am pretty confident that before the summer is over, I can sign into law comprehensive immigration reform that will strengthen our borders, fix our legal immigration system, and make sure that those who are here and are undocumented can earn their way — in an arduous process, but earn their way — to be full-fledged members of our country,” the president said.¶ If he’s right, then a genuine instance of bipartisanship will have occurred. Without Republican support, Obama simply cannot win what he is asking for. And without some Democratic concessions, Republicans will not sign off. This much is clear.

#### Path to citizenship portion of bill key to determining potential passage; border security is issue for the left; must compromise to get passed

Dinan 7/8/13 (Stephen The Washington Times “All eyes on border as House bill takes shape; Immigrant groups hold out for hope” July 8, 2013 SECTION: A, PAGE ONE; Pg. 1, l/n)

House Republicans will meet this week to plan their immigration strategy, which seems designed to push the issue to the right, but the Senate bill already faces a backlash on the left, where advocacy groups say the added border security is testing the limits of enforcement.¶ Many immigrant rights groups watched in despair as senators voted last month to add 20,000 Border Patrol agents and hundreds of miles of fencing in the Southwest. ¶ As senators were voting, volunteers from the Reform Immigration for Texas Alliance were getting arrested for demonstrating outside Democratic Party offices in Dallas and Austin to protest what appeared to be a major reversal by Senate Democrats, who had said an earlier bill would provide enough border security.¶ "Our response was, 'Look, we are not celebrating the bill,'" said Adriana Cadena, statewide coordinator for the Texas Alliance. She said her group hasn't taken an official position on the legislation as a whole and sees good parts of it, including quick citizenship for Dream Act youths and agriculture workers, but members also wanted to register their disapproval of the "immense militarization and criminalization" in the final Senate bill.¶ Most immigrant rights groups remain on board. They say they are wary of the direction of the debate but that the additional border security provision hasn't spoiled the entire bill.¶ "It was absolutely a difficult decision," said Ruthie Epstein, a legislative policy analyst at the American Civil Liberties Union. "Nevertheless, we did ultimately decide, reluctantly, to support the bill moving forward because the bill retains its core commitment to providing a fair if difficult path to citizenship."¶ The Senate bill cleared on a 68-32 vote with 14 Republicans joining all of the members of the Democratic caucus in backing it. That vote signaled that the core of the deal - to offer quick legal status and work permits to illegal immigrants but to withhold full citizenship rights until the border is considered secure - is holding.¶ Analysts on all sides of the issue have decried the Senate's border surge, saying the money is unlikely to produce much of a return on the dollar.¶ Ms. Epstein and other opponents said building up the border with that many agents could cause a spike in human rights abuses. During a surge under the George W. Bush administration, the Department of Homeland Security struggled to hire and train Border Patrol agents.¶ In Congress, action has shifted to the House, where Republicans hold a majority. They will meet Wednesday to hash out their strategy.¶ Several key differences have emerged - and none more critical than the approaches to a pathway to citizenship. Most Senate Republicans, including those who voted against the bill, agreed that a pathway is needed but fought over what conditions to attach to it.¶ That view is not universal among House Republicans, many of whom say that granting illegal immigrants citizenship is an amnesty for breaking the law.¶ Beyond that fight, House Speaker John A. Boehner, Ohio Republican, has called the security provision in the Senate bill "laughable." He has signaled that whatever the House does, it will go beyond the border buildup in the Senate legislation.¶ It's not clear how much leverage immigrant rights groups will have in the House.¶ With House Republicans under pressure to strengthen the bill, many immigrant rights groups say the Senate bill is their high-water mark and they now will be playing chiefly defense. It's one reason so many groups were upset that the Senate added border security rather than waiting to fight the issue with the House.¶ But some groups argue, at least publicly, that the House bill won't necessarily be stronger than the Senate version.¶ According to some reports, a bipartisan group of seven House lawmakers negotiating a deal may even be looking at a shorter path to citizenship than the one in the Senate agreement.¶ Rep. Raul R. Labrador, an Idaho Republican who used to be part of that bipartisan group of negotiators, said there is little doubt that the House bill will focus more on security than the Senate version.¶ "My concern with the Senate bill is that they put the legalization of 11 million people ahead of security. The legalization happens first, and then the security happens second," he told NBC's "Meet the Press" program Sunday.¶ He said he doesn't want a repeat of what he considers mistakes of implementing the president's health care law by giving the administration a large amount of power. ¶ Mr. Labrador said it would be a mistake to turn over border security decisions to the Obama administration.¶ Rep. Michael T. McCaul, Texas Republican and chairman of the House Homeland Security Committee, said on CBS' "Face the Nation" program that the House also wants to avoid another part of the health care debate, when the House took up and passed the Senate's bill in its entirety, unchanged.¶ Some Senate Democrats have predicted that the House will do that with the Senate immigration bill, but Mr. McCaul said that won't happen.¶ Earlier this year, he cleared a tough border security bill through his committee on a unanimous bipartisan vote, and he derided the Senate's plan to add agents and fencing as throwing money at the problem.¶ "What the Senate just passed was, again, a bunch of, you know, candy thrown down there, a bunch of assets thrown down there to gain votes but without a methodical, smart border approach," he said. "We want a smart border. We also want a smart immigration plan, something that makes sense."¶ Mr. McCaul said his own border security bill could be on the House floor later this month or in September.¶ Ms. Cadena from the Texas Alliance said she hasn't given up hope that the House could ease some of the border provisions - particularly if groups pressure representatives at the local level.¶ "I think that people have pretty much given up that what we got in the Senate is the best we're going to get, from now on it's only going to get worse. There might be some truth to that, but those of us who are in the field out in Texas or other parts of the country, it's too soon to make that determination," she said. ¶ "At the end of the day, all politics is local. We're trying to influence some of these members who may be in swing districts or may be in significant Latino population."

#### Internal link – The plan poisons the well of cooperation --- prevents passage of future initiatives

Wallsten 12/8 (Peter Wallsten and Zachary A. Goldfarb, 12/8/2012, “Obama’s second-term agenda will be shadowed by budget woes,” <http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/obamas-second-term-agenda-will-be-shadowed-by-budget-woes/2012/12/08/ea97e956-4091-11e2-ae43-cf491b837f7b_story.html>)

One House GOP leadership aide said Obama would be unwise “if he comes in here and poisons the well by trying to break as many Republicans as he can. By nature of how politics works, you’re going to see a lot less cooperation going forward.”¶ Rep. Peter Roskam (R-Ill.), a top Boehner lieutenant, hinted at that sentiment among House Republicans last week when he told reporters Obama had “an unbelievable opportunity to be a transformational president” by bringing the parties together for a debt deal. “Or he can dissolve into zero-sum game politics, where he wins and . . . other people lose.”

#### Immigration passage is contingent on continued bipartisan cooperation

Fabian, 1/30 (Jordan, 1/30/2013, “Obama Confident Immigration Reform Passes This Year,” <http://abcnews.go.com/ABC_Univision/Politics/president-obama-confident-immigration-reform-passes-year/story?id=18358660>))

President Barack Obama expressed confidence on Wednesday that he would sign comprehensive immigration reform into law by the end of this year.¶ In an interview with Univision's Maria Elena Salinas, Obama explained that significant details of a bill still must be worked out by lawmakers, including the structure of a pathway to citizenship for many of the 11 million undocumented immigrants. But Obama said that the progress made by a bipartisan group of lawmakers in the Senate has given him hope that a deal can get done.¶See Also: Transcript: President Obama's Interview¶ When asked by Salinas if we will have immigration reform by the end of the year, Obama said, "I believe so."¶ "You can tell our audience, 'Sí, se puede?'" Salinas asked.¶ "Sí, se puede," Obama responded.¶ Later in the interview, Obama said that he hopes a bill could be passed as early as this summer.¶ But cognizant of deep divisions a topic like immigration has sewn in the past, Obama said that's contingent on bipartisan negotiations continuing to proceed well.¶ "The only way this is going to get done is if the Republicans continue to work with Democrats in Congress, in both chambers, to get a bill to my desk," he said. "And I'm going to keep on pushing as hard as I can. I believe that the mood is right."¶ Maria Elena Salinas talks to President Obama after his Las Vegas announcement on immigration reform.¶ Univision¶ Maria Elena Salinas talks to President Obama... View Full Size¶ Although the president threatened to introduce his own bill if negotiations in Congress stall during his speech in Las Vegas, Nevada, on Tuesday, he said he is content to let lawmakers hash out the details among themselves for the time being.¶ "If they are on a path as they have already said, where they want to get a bill done by March, then I think that's a reasonable timeline and I think we can get that done. I'm not going to lay down a particular date because I want to give them a little room to debate," he said. "If it slips a week, that's one thing. If it starts slipping three months, that's a problem."¶ The president's principles and the Senate's principles on immigration broadly align with one another, but there are still thorny issues that could spark a division between Obama and Republicans, such as the pathway to citizenship.¶ The Senate's path to citizenship would allow many undocumented immigrants to obtain legal status immediately upon passage of the law. But their ability to then seek legal permanent residency would be contingent upon the U.S.-Mexico border being deemed secure. Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.), a member of the bipartisan "Gang of Eight" on immigration, has been particularly vocal in stating that border security is a precondition for gaining legal permanent residence, and then citizenship.

#### Bipartisan cooperation key to passage

Epstein, 1/30 (Jennifer, 1/30/2013, “President Obama: Get immigration reform done by summer,” <http://www.politico.com/story/2013/01/obama-immigration-reform-by-summer-86968.html>))

President Barack Obama hopes to see Congress to pass a major immigration reform bill by early summer, he said Wednesday, as he blamed resistance on Capitol Hill for the failure to get the reforms done during his first term.

“I’m not a king,” he told Telemundo, as he followed up on his Tuesday trip to Las Vegas to unveil his proposals for reform with interviews with Spanish-language television networks. “You know, my job as the head of the executive branch ultimately is to carry out the law. And, you know, when it comes to enforcement of our immigration laws we’ve got some discretion. We can prioritize what we do. But we can’t simply ignore the law.”

Obama took executive action last year to change the federal enforcement of immigration laws, helping young adults avoid deportation if serving in the military or pursuing higher education.

He said he would push for legislation to make further changes. Though he’s left it to Congress to work out the details, the president said the White House has already written its own that he’ll send for an up or down vote if lawmakers are too slow.

“I’ve got a bill drafted. We’ve got language,” he said.

But he said that he hoped Congress would not force things to come to that.

“I think this is something we should be able to get done certainly this year and I’d like to see if we could get it done sooner, in the first half of the year if possible,” Obama said.

In an interview with Univision also taped Wednesday, Obama said he’s confident that immigration reform will pass before the end of the year. “Si, se puede,” he said at the prompting of interviewer Maria Elena Salinas, repurposing the slogan used by farm workers that was then turned into the English-language rallying cry for his 2008 campaign as “Yes we can.”

What’s still holding back action “is not so much technical as it’s political,” Obama said in his interview with Telemundo, which was conducted by Jose Diaz-Balart. “It’s a matter of Republicans and Democrats coming together and finding a meeting of the minds and then making the case. I’m hopeful that this can get done, and I don’t think that it should take many, many months.”

Diaz-Balart said he’d checked with the offices of Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.) and other Republicans supportive of the immigration reform proposal put out by a bipartisan group of eight senators on Monday, and that none of them reported having heard from Obama on the issue.

Obama said he was open to talking to anyone, but indicated that the outreach had to come from Capitol Hill. “I am happy to meet with anybody, anytime, anywhere to make sure that this thing happens,” he said. “You know, the truth is oftentimes what happens is members of Congress prefer meeting among themselves to build trust between Democrats and Republicans there.”

“They want assistance from us but sometimes they want it through back channels,” he added. “And, you know, if they want a public meeting, if they want private meetings, anything that is necessary to move this thing forward, we’re happy to.”

Some immigrants-rights groups have urged Obama to put a moratorium on all deportations until Congress works through its current reform push. But Obama said it’s his responsibility to continue overseeing the enforcement of existing federal laws.

“There are still going to be stories that are heartbreaking with respect to deportations until we get comprehensive immigration reform,” he said in his interview with Univision. “That’s one of the reasons I think it’s so important for us to go ahead and get this action done.”

### AT: XO Solves

#### Executive action fails – deters employers and immigrants

Cox and Rodriguez ‘9 Adam & cristina Adam B. Cox is a Professor of Law, University of Chicago Law School. Cristina M. Rodríguez is a Professor of Law, New York University School of Law. “The President and Immigration Law” The Yale Law Journal 119:458 2009

For example, in situations in which the Executive would prefer to admit immigrants with lawful status, it is largely powerless to do so. Their lawful admission would be inconsistent with the admissions criteria established by Congress. One instance in which the Executive might prefer access to the lawful path is when potential immigrants are unable or unwilling to bear the risks associated with unlawful entry. Whereas many low-skilled migrants with few other options bear these risks, high-skilled immigrants often will not. Migration to the United States may be less valuable to the latter, because they have more migration options, or because they have economic prospects at home sufficient to support a family and live a good life. What is more, employers of high-skilled immigrants may be much less likely to take the risk of flouting the immigration laws than employers of lower skilled labor. For high-skilled migrants, then, the delegation of ex post screening authority substitutes poorly for ex ante authority.

#### No executive action – Obama knows the risks

Hamilton 3/26 (Keegan, “How Obama Could (but Probably Won't) Stop Deporting Illegal Immigrants Today”, http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/homeland-security/277799-dont-wait-for-president-obama-to-act-on-immigration-reform#ixzz2OrYPaWXd , CMR)

With immigration-reform legislation inching toward the president's desk, it's unlikely he'll waste political capital by halting deportations or even reducing the immigrant detainee population, despite the budgetary considerations. The prospect of doing anything that might alienate Republicans, especially with a compromise so close, alarms activists like Tamar Jacoby, president of ImmigrationWorks USA, an advocacy group comprised largely of small-business owners.¶ "We have a Congress for a reason," Jacoby says. "To fix anything permanently you need to have legislation, and in order for that to happen it has to be bipartisan. My worst nightmare is the president thinking, 'I don't need bipartisan legislation. Why share credit with Republicans? I can just go on and do this myself.' I think that's a disastrous political strategy."¶ If the current congressional push for immigration reform were to fail, however, a presidential pardon for undocumented immigrants with no criminal history might be Obama's last ditch alternative to prosecutorial discretion. Rather than scaling back on detentions, Obama could instantly--and permanently-- legalize millions of illegal immigrants. Beck, the Georgia law scholar, notes that the Constitution empowers the president to "grant reprieves and pardons for offences against the United States, except in cases of impeachment."¶ The question, he says, is "whether coming into the country in violation of the immigration laws or overstaying a visa could be deemed an 'offense against the United States.'" But the president has broad powers of pardon, and it seems that Obama could exercise those powers here. Beck cites United States v. Klein, an 1871 Supreme Court case that involved a presidential pardon issued during the Civil War to confederates who rejoined the union and took an oath of loyalty.¶ But even if executive-branch lawyers could put forth a legal rationale for the move, there are political reasons why Obama would likely be reluctant to make it. Although potentially cementing loyalty from a generation of Latinos, a mass pardon would likely be deeply unpopular with moderates and liberals who put faith in the legislative process, and would be considered downright treasonous by many Republicans. Obama could face Congressional censure or perhaps even impeachment if he had any time remaining in office, and the backlash against Democrats could make the Tea Party-fueled, Obamacare-inspired shellacking of 2010 look mild.¶ "If in December 2016 Obama says, 'Unconditional pardon to everybody in the country illegally,' that would totally dismantle Democratic Party governance for a generation," Mayer says. "I don't think he wants that to be his legacy."

### AT: No Spillover/PC Not Key

**Presidential leadership shapes the agenda**

**Kuttner 11** (Robert, Senior Fellow – Demos and Co-editor – American Prospect, “Barack Obama's Theory of Power,” The American Prospect, 5-16, <http://prospect.org/cs/articles?article=barack_obamas_theory_of_power>, CMR)

**As the political scientist** Richard **Neustadt observed** in his classic work, Presidential Power, a book that had great influence on President John F. Kennedy, **the essence of a president's power is "the power to persuade."** Because our divided constitutional system does not allow the president to lead by commanding, **presidents amass power by** making strategic choices **about when to use the latent authority of the presidency to move public and elite opinion and then use that added prestige as clout to move Congress.** In one of Neustadt's classic case studies, Harry Truman, a president widely considered a lame duck, nonetheless persuaded the broad public and a Republican Congress in 1947-1948 that the Marshall Plan was a worthy idea. As Neustadt and Burns both observed, **though an American chief executive is weak by constitutional design, a president possesses several points of leverage. He can play an effective outside game, motivating and shaping public sentiment, making clear the differences between his values and those of his opposition, and using popular support to box in his opponents and** move them in his direction**. He can complement the outside bully pulpit with a nimble inside game,** unit**ing his legislative party, bestowing or withholding benefits on opposition legislators, forcing them to take awkward votes, and using the veto. He can also enlist the support of interest groups to** pressure Congress**, and use media to validate his framing of choices. Done well, all of this** signals leadership **that often** moves the **public** agenda**.**

**PC is key and finite—Congress will link unrelated issues**

**Haftel ’11** (Yoram Z, Assist Prof, PhD @ Ohio State, “Delayed Ratification: The Domestic Fate of Bilateral Investment Treaties”, December, <http://polisci.osu.edu/faculty/athompson/pdf/Delayed_Ratification_Dec2011.pdf>, CMR)

Of course, leaders face many political obstacles that are not captured in the formal process of treaty ratification, and it is important to consider such constraints in addition to the specific hurdles governing treaty ratification. As one U.S. BIT negotiator explained, it is not just the ratification institutions that Washington takes into account in a partner, “it’s how freely the government functions.”34 Like **legislation and** other **policy initiatives**, treaty ratification **is subject to** issue-linkage **at the domestic level and often requires the expenditure of finite political capital**, **thus the executive must take into account these broader political dynamics** when advocating for a treaty. **For example**, President **Obama’s efforts to secure** Senate ratification of the new **START** treaty with Russia **were held up** by Republicans **in Congress as part of a broad political strategy, not for reasons related to** proliferation or **national security.** Partly for these reasons, and because executives may depend on legislatures and local governments to implement a treaty’s provisions, the preferences of other domestic actors matter even when they do not play a formal role in ratification. In Canada, for example, the prime minister often seeks to “build a broad base of support for international treaties”35—even though no such legal requirement exists.

### AT: No Spillover

#### Yes spillover – fights over Latin America force zero-sum tradeoffs

Whitehead & Nolte 12 (Laurence Whitehead, senior research fellow in politics at Nuffield College, Oxford, and Detlef Nolte, acting president of the GIGA, director of the GIGA Institute of Latin American Studies, professor of political science at the University of Hamburg, Number 6, 2012, <http://www.giga-hamburg.de/dl/download.php?d=/content/publikationen/pdf/gf_international_1206.pdf>, CMR)

Two years into Obama’s first term, researchers at the Brookings Institution revisited some ¶ of these ideas in light of the developments that ¶ had taken place so far (Lowenthal, Piccone, and ¶ Whitehead 2010). While the emphasis and interpretations of the various contributors differed, ¶ there was a general recognition that most of these ¶ initial hopes had been set too high. Symptomatic of this was the fact that the promise to close ¶ Guantanamo prison had not been honored, and ¶ that, after no more than the briefest of pauses, the ¶ “ALBA” group, led by President Chávez, had resumed its negative discourse. Obviously, the ¶ gravity of the economic crisis facing the incoming ¶ president had absorbed most of his energies, and ¶ in the foreign policy domain continuing and severe security challenges in Iraq, Afghanistan and ¶ elsewhere in the Muslim world had necessarily taken priority over less urgent Western Hemisphere concerns. On the domestic political front ¶ the new president had run into ferocious opposition to his healthcare reforms, and a deeply polarized internal climate had drastically reduced his ¶ room for maneuver on peripheral issues.

#### Latin America policy drains political capital – crowds-out other issues

Rozental 10 – member of the Advisor board, president of Rozental & Asociados in Mexico City and senior fellow at the Brookings Institution (Andres, “What Do the U.S. Election Results Mean for Latin America?”, 11/8, <http://www.thedialogue.org/page.cfm?pageID=32&pubID=2505>, CMR)

A: Andrés Rozental, member of the Advisor board, president of Rozental & Asociados in Mexico City and senior fellow at the Brookings Institution: "The results of the U.S. congressional elections can only be sobering news for Latin America in general, and Mexico in particular. With a political and foreign policy agenda in Washington already crowded with issues unrelated to our region, it would appear that the hemisphere will slip even further down on the list of priorities for both the Obama administration and Congress. The change of control in the House probably means that even if he really wanted to move the immigration and gun control agenda forward, President Barack Obama won't have the political capital needed to counter newly elected right-wing Republicans and Tea Party representatives who generally oppose comprehensive immigration reform or any limitations on Second Amendment rights to buy and own all types of weapons, many of which find their way to the drug cartels in Mexico and beyond. Although some analysts have forecast an increased foreign policy interest by the White House after the Nov. 2 elections, any such change will most probably focus on Afghanistan, India-Pakistan relations, Iran and the Middle East peace process, not on the immediate neighborhood. Congress has already reduced the amount of assistance under Plan Mérida to Mexico, Central America and the Caribbean, which was meant to materialize the 'shared responsibility' that the United States has rhetorically assumed for the war on drugs since Obama was elected two years ago. Nothing on his or the immediate congressional agenda would indicate today that relations with Latin America might substantially change during the remaining biennium of his first term."

# \*\*Neg Impacts – CIR Good\*\*

## Misc/Sort

### 2NC Hegemony

#### Reform key to hegemony – biggest, quickest internal link

Kliman ’10 – visiting fellow at the Center for a New American Security [Daniel, “Immigration and American Power”, May 28, <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2010/05/28/opinion/main6525992.shtml>] CR

President Obama’s National Security Strategy released on Thursday has launched the opening salvo in a battle to recast what immigration means to the United States. The new strategy observes that American prosperity and leadership depends on “attracting the premier human capital for our workforce.” That is, immigration equals national power. This recasting comes at a critical moment. The United States can no longer take for granted its capacity to attract and retain foreign talent. Successfully competing for the world’s best and brightest requires urgent immigration reform. American power and immigration are closely interlinked. The most dynamic sectors of the U.S. economy are heavily dependent on foreign talent. Immigrants have founded 25percent of public, venture-backed U.S. companies, including eBay, Yahoo, and Google. Between 1995 and 2005, foreigners from just two countries - China and India - accounted for almost 30 percent of all Silicon Valley startups. American leadership in science and technology also rests on the inflow of talent from abroad. As fewer and fewer U.S. citizens have chosen careers in science, foreigners have stepped in to fill the gap. One-fourth of America’s science and engineering workforce is foreign-born. In 2007, foreigners accounted for almost 50 percent of all science and engineering doctorates awarded in the United States. Immigration is not inevitably destined to remain a wellspring of American power. Historically, greater economic opportunity, superior universities, a relatively open immigration system, and a tolerant society rendered the United States an irresistible magnet for immigrants. But the world is rapidly changing, and the most talented immigrants may no longer stay. Home to the fastest growing major economies, Asia has become a region of opportunity for returnees who are highly educated or have overseas work experience. Asian governments have begun to actively court their expatriates. China, for example, uses world-class facilities, plentiful grant money, and prestigious titles to woo researchers living abroad. Whether America’s ability to cream off the best and brightest has already declined remains uncertain. Prior to the financial crisis, the “stay rates” for foreigners receiving PhDs in science and engineering increased slightly. But a 2008 survey of foreign students enrolled in U.S. higher education found that 55 percent of Indian respondents and 40 percent of Chinese respondents wanted to return home within five years. If this snapshot is predictive, then “stay rates” for these groups are set to substantially decline. The United States cannot rest on its laurels. Sustaining American power will require stepping up efforts to attract and retain foreign talent. A number of worthy proposals already exist. One would be to increase the number of H-1B visas for foreigners with critical skills. Another would be the creation of a new visa for immigrant entrepreneurs, as outlined in a Senate bill recently introduced by John Kerry and Richard Lugar. The bill would establish a visa for immigrants who raise startup funds from U.S. investors and grant them legal residence if the venture generates at least five jobs. A third would focus on foreigners in science and engineering graduate programs. Any number of measures could make the United States a more attractive long-term home for them. Hand out Green Cards with their diplomas. Automatically grant them work visas upon graduation. Or introduce a flexible visa allowing them to move between the United States and their home country for a ten-year period with an ultimate option of settling in the United States and expedited citizenship. A fourth would recognize that immigrants often return home to be closer to family. The United States could facilitate visas for family members of foreigners who work in science and technology-related industries. The overarching objective of President Obama’s National Security Strategy is to renew American power. Promoting immigration is the most immediate way to do so. Other wellsprings of American power, such as infrastructure and education, can only be moved in a positive direction over the long term. Major projects to upgrade America’s infrastructure will take years, while the returns from improving education will require a generation to realize. Although these goals should be pursued as well, renewing American power starts with welcoming foreign talent to America’s shore.

**Key to the economy and heg**

**Palomarez 3/6** – President & CEO of the United States Hispanic Chamber of Commerce (3/6/2013, Javier, “The Pent Up Entrepreneurship That Immigration Reform Would Unleash,” <http://www.forbes.com/sites/realspin/2013/03/06/the-pent-up-entrepreneurship-that-immigration-reform-would-unleash/>, CMR)

**Washington recently took a major step forward in negotiations on comprehensive immigration reform**. Tom **Donohue, President of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and** Richard **Trumka, the President of the AFL-CIO, announced a compromise for dealing with lesser-skilled workers in immigration reform**.¶ This is progress. In 2007, neither side would even come to the table to discuss their differences, so this effort sends a clear signal that both corporate America and our country’s workers understand the importance of comprehensive immigration reform to their bottom line.¶ How did this compromise come about?¶ The main difference between now and 2007 is that today the role of immigrants and their many contributions to the American economy have been central in the country’s national conversation on the issue.¶ Never before have Latinos been so central to the election of a U.S. President as in 2012. New evidence about the economic importance of immigration reform, coupled with the new political realities presented by the election, have given reform a higher likelihood of passing.¶ As the President & CEO of the country’s largest Hispanic business association, the U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce (USHCC), which advocates for the interests of over 3 million Hispanic owned businesses, I have noticed that nearly every meeting I hold with corporate leaders now involves a discussion of how and when immigration reform will pass. The USHCC has long seen comprehensive immigration reform as an economic imperative, and now the wider business community seems to be sharing our approach. It is no longer a question of whether it will pass.¶ **Out of countless conversations with business leaders in virtually every sector and every state, a consensus has emerged: our broken and outdated immigration system hinders our economy’s growth and puts America’s global leadership in jeopardy.**¶ **Innovation drives the American economy, and without good ideas and skilled workers, our country won’t be able to transform industries or to lead world markets as effectively as it has done for decades.**¶Consider some figures: Immigrant-owned firms generate an estimated $775 billion in annual revenue, $125 billion in payroll and about $100 billion in income. A study conducted by the New American Economy found that over 40 percent of Fortune 500 companies were started by immigrants or children of immigrants.¶ Leading brands, like Google, Kohls, eBay, Pfizer, and AT&T, were founded by immigrants. Researchers at the Kauffman Foundation released a study late last year showing that from 2006 to 2012, one in four engineering and technology companies started in the U.S. had at least one foreign-born founder — in Silicon Valley it was almost half of new companies.¶ **There are an estimated 11 million undocumented workers currently in the U.S. Imagine what small business growth in the U.S. would look like if they were provided legal status, if they had an opportunity for citizenship. Without fear of deportation or prosecution, imagine the pent up entrepreneurship that could be unleashed.** After all, these are people who are clearly entrepreneurial in spirit to have come here and risk all in the first place.¶ Immigrants are twice as likely to start businesses as native-born Americans, and statistics show that most job growth comes from small businesses.¶ While **immigrants** are both critically-important consumers and producers, they **boost the economic well-being of native-born Americans as well**.¶ Scholars at the Brookings Institution recently described the relationship of these two groups of workers as complementary. This is because lower-skilled immigrants largely take farming and other manual, low-paid jobs that native-born workers don’t usually want.¶ For example, when Alabama passed HB 56, an immigration law in 2012 aimed at forcing self-deportation, the state lost roughly $11 billion in economic productivity as crops were left to wither and jobs were lost.¶ **Immigration reform would also** address another important angle in the debate – the need to **entice high-skilled immigrants**. Higher-skilled immigrants provide talent that high-tech companies often cannot locate domestically. High-tech leaders recently organized a nationwide “virtual march for immigration reform” to pressure policymakers to remove barriers that prevent them from recruiting the workers they need.¶ Finally, and perhaps most importantly, fixing immigration makes sound fiscal sense. Economist Raul Hinojosa-Ojeda calculated in 2010 that **comprehensive immigration reform would add $1.5 trillion to the country’s GDP over 10 years and add $66 billion in tax revenue** – enough to fully fund the Small Business Administration and the Departments of the Treasury and Commerce for over two years.¶ **As Congress continues to wring its hands and debate the issue, lawmakers must understand what both businesses and workers already know: The American economy needs comprehensive immigration reform.**

### 1NC Terrorism

#### Immigration reform decreases terror risk—multiple mechanisms

Griswold 04 (Daniel, Senior Fellow @ CATO, Federal News Service, 4/1, lexis)

MR. DANIEL GRISWOLD: Thank you, Chairman Chambliss, and members of the subcommittee for allowing the Cato Institute to testify on the pressing issue of border security and immigration reform. Since the terrorist attacks of September 11th, 2001, Congress and the administration and this subcommittee have labored to balance the need to secure our borders with our need to remain a free society, open to the world. Long time opponents of immigration seized on the attacks to argue against legalization of Mexican migration and in favor of drastic cuts in existing levels of legal immigration. But any connection between terrorism and illegal immigration from Mexico is tenuous. None of the 19 hijackers entered the country illegally or as immigrants. They all arrived in the United States with valid temporary non-immigrant visas. None of them arrived via Mexico. None of them were Mexican. Sealing our Southwestern border with a three- tiered, 2,000 mile wall patrolled by a division of U.S. troops would not have kept a single one of those terrorists out of the United States. The problem, Mr. Chairman, is not too many immigrants but insufficient control over who enters the country. Immigrants who come to the United States to work and settle are but a small subset of the tens of millions of foreign born people who enter the United States every year. In fact, on a typical day, as you know, more than one million people enter the United States legally by air, land and sea, through more than 300 ports of entry. In a typical year more than 30 million individual foreign nationals enter the United States as tourists, business travelers, students, diplomats and temporary workers. Now, of those, about 1.3 million will eventually settle here as permanent immigrant residents, some of them illegally. In other words, less than 5 percent of the foreigners who enter the United States each year intend to immigrate in any sense of the word. We could reduce immigration to zero and still not be safe from terrorists who might enter on temporary non-immigrant visas. Our focus, one might say our obsession in recent years with stifling the migration of Mexicans across our Southwest border has not served our national security interest. It has diverted resources and attention away from efforts to identify and keep out people who truly mean to do us harm. While we were guarding the back door in 2001 to make sure no Mexican immigrants entered our country illegally to work, we were neglecting the far larger barn door of temporary non-immigrant visas through which all the September 11th hijackers entered. Most members of Congress understand that willing workers from Mexico are not a threat to America's national security. In May 2002 Congress overwhelmingly approved and the president signed the Enhanced Border Security and Visa Entry Reform Act. We don't get to say this very much at Cato, but that was a good piece of legislation. The law was aimed at the right target: keeping terrorists out of the United States. It mandates a timely sharing of intelligence with the State Department and Border Control agencies and use of machine readable and tamper resistant entry documents among other commonsense reform. Notably absent from the bill were any provisions rolling back levels of legal immigration or bolstering efforts to curb illegal migration from Mexico. Indeed, legalization and regularization -- legalizing and regularizing the movement of workers across the U.S.-Mexican border would enhance our national security by bringing much of the underground labor market into the open, encouraging newly documented workers to fully cooperate with law enforcement officials, and freeing resources for border security and the war on terrorism. Real immigration reform would drain a large part of the underground swamp of smuggling and document fraud that facilitates illegal immigration. It would reduce the demand for fraudulent documents which in turn would reduce the supply available for terrorists trying to operate surreptitiously inside the United States. It would eliminate most of the human smuggling operations I believe overnight. The vast majority of Mexican workers who enter the United States have no criminal records or intentions, they would obviously prefer to enter the country in a safe, orderly, legal way through the standard ports of entry rather than putting their lives in the hands of unscrupulous smugglers. Just as importantly, legalization would encourage millions of currently undocumented workers to make themselves known to authorities by registering with the government, reducing cover for terrorists who manage to enter the country and overstay their visas. Workers with legal documents would be more inclined to cooperate with law enforcement because they wouldn't fear deportation. Immigration reform would free up enforcement and border control resources to focus on protecting the American homeland from terrorist attack. Our Department of Homeland Security, which I believe has a hiring freeze on right now, should concentrate its limited resources and personnel on tracking and hunting down terrorists instead of raiding chicken processing plants and busting janitors at discount stores. Congress should respond to the leadership shown by President Bush and reform our dysfunctional immigration system. Immigration reform would help our economy grow, it would enhance -- and it would reduce illegal immigration and it would enhance the federal government's ability to wage war on terrorism.

#### Nuclear war--retaliation

Patrick F. Speice, "Negligence and Nuclear Nonproliferation: Eliminating the Current Liability Barrier to Bilateral U.S.-Russian Nonproliferation Assistance Programs," WILLIAM & MARY LAW REVIEW v. 47, 2--06, p. 1437-1438.

Accordingly, there is a significant and ever-present risk that terrorists could acquire a nuclear device or fissile material from Russia as a result of the confluence of Russian economic decline and the end of stringent Soviet-era nuclear security measures. 39 Terrorist groups could acquire a nuclear weapon by a number of methods, including "steal[ing] one intact from the stockpile of a country possessing such weapons, or ... [being] sold or given one by [\*1438] such a country, or [buying or stealing] one from another subnational group that had obtained it in one of these ways." 40 Equally threatening, however, is the risk that terrorists will steal or purchase fissile material and construct a nuclear device on their own. Very little material is necessary to construct a highly destructive nuclear weapon. 41 Although nuclear devices are extraordinarily complex, the technical barriers to constructing a workable weapon are not significant. 42 Moreover, the sheer number of methods that could be used to deliver a nuclear device into the United States makes it incredibly likely that terrorists could successfully employ a nuclear weapon once it was built. 43 Accordingly, supply-side controls that are aimed at preventing terrorists from acquiring nuclear material in the first place are the most effective means of countering the risk of nuclear terrorism. 44 Moreover, the end of the Cold War eliminated the rationale for maintaining a large military-industrial complex in Russia, and the nuclear cities were closed. 45 This resulted in at least 35,000 nuclear scientists becoming unemployed in an economy that was collapsing. 46 Although the economy has stabilized somewhat, there [\*1439] are still at least 20,000 former scientists who are unemployed or underpaid and who are too young to retire, 47 raising the chilling prospect that these scientists will be tempted to sell their nuclear knowledge, or steal nuclear material to sell, to states or terrorist organizations with nuclear ambitions. 48 The potential consequences of the unchecked spread of nuclear knowledge and material to terrorist groups that seek to cause mass destruction in the United States are truly horrifying. A terrorist attack with a nuclear weapon would be devastating in terms of immediate human and economic losses.49 Moreover, there would be immense political pressure in the United States to discover the perpetrators and retaliate with nuclear weapons, massively increasing the number of casualties and potentially triggering a full-scale nuclear conflict

### AT: No Skilled Worker Shortage

#### Yes shortages – New immigrants key to start-ups and entrepreneurship

Wee ‘13 (Heesun, “How Lack of Immigration Reform Harms Startups, US Economy”, 1/24, 2013, <http://www.cnbc.com/id/100401598>, CMR)

As President Barack Obama begins his second term, small companies and the technology community are hoping for immigration reform to help them secure highly skilled foreign workers.¶ Overhauling U.S. immigration law has been long-awaited for years. But without political consensus on the issue, technology startups in particular have felt the pains of limited works visas. They've also absorbed the high legal fees associated with the visa process — costs that few cash-strapped upstarts can afford.¶ "I've been blown away by how much the immigration policy has been kicking us in the teeth," said Alex Salazar, chief executive and co-founder of Stormpath, a Silicon Valley startup that's been struggling to find candidates in engineering, computer science and software development. Most of his candidates are from outside the U.S., and half the recruitment conversations are about visas.¶ "In Silicon Valley it's a war for talent — an all out knuckle-drag war," Salazar said. And America's current immigration policy only slows Salazar's ability to hire specialized talent in a tech sector that's hot, competitive and only growing.¶ Frustrated by how the drawn-out visa process is hampering his 11-employee business and its grow path, Salazar posted the following note on his Facebook page: "If you want to be a great startup CEO, become an expert in U.S. immigration policy."¶ Hopes for Immigration Reform¶ Stormpath and other startups say they can't efficiently hire qualified foreign candidates because of a shortage of temporary work visas and green cards. They've been pushing for legislation that would allow more immigrants with high-tech skills to remain in the country.¶ "The demand for software developer talent is growing so much faster than our own American candidate pool is growing — regardless of why," Salazar said. "The demand is insatiable. I can't just grab someone from a regular school and give them two months of training and throw them on our projects. You have to have six to seven years of experience, computer science degrees from the top schools."¶ Immigration reform wasn't a priority during Obama's first term. But during his second inaugural address, Obama hinted at change.¶ "Our journey is not complete until we find a better way to welcome the striving, hopeful immigrants who still see America as a land of opportunity," the president said, "until bright young students and engineers are enlisted in our workforce, rather than expelled from our country."¶ Gary Shapiro, president and chief executive of the Consumer Electronics Association, has been a vocal advocate of immigration reform. The message from the White House seems to be that Obama won't agree to raising visa caps for highly skilled immigrants unless it is part of a broader reform plan, he said.¶ "When I talk to our industry members, they all say it [the lack of immigration reform] is a problem for their companies," Shapiro said. "And it's not just our industry." Biotechnology and medical fields are experiencing similar struggles to fill specialized slots, he said.¶ Shapiro argues the current immigration landscape combined with our corporate tax policy dampens American entrepreneurship. "Between immigration and the tax system, it's a very harmful strategy to economic growth and job creation in the United States," Shapiro said.¶ Shapiro and other tech leaders were disappointed when the White House and Congress failed to pass a bill late last year that would have removed random lottery slots for hard science PhDs. The bill, known as the STEM Jobs Act, would have helped keep foreign-born graduates in America. The STEM fields are science, technology, engineering and mathematics.

#### Immigration reform key to start-ups and commercialization – otherwise collapse of industries is inevitable

Moritz ’13 (Michael, Chairman at Sequoia Capital, “Immigration Reform: Stop Ejecting the Brightest Minds From America”, <http://www.linkedin.com/today/post/article/20130128153456-25760-immigration-reform-stop-ejecting-the-brightest-minds-from-america>, CMR)

Let's hope Congress does not flinch as it begins the debate about immigration reform because the future is passing through security – in the wrong direction. It leaves the United States on every departing airplane carrying a foreign born student who has graduated from an American university with an advanced degree in the sciences, technology, engineering and math. The majority of these people want to stay in the United States but because of existing immigration laws, they have no choice but to leave.¶ In Silicon Valley, which has always been blind to any attribute other than ability, everyone knows that the remarkable achievements of the foreign born have led to the formation of companies such as Google, Intel, Sun Microsystems, nVidia, Yahoo! PayPal and scores of others that are less well known. Of the last eleven early stage companies that have allied themselves with Sequoia Capital, seven have had immigrants among their founding lineup. This is not a sudden or recent phenomenon; it has been the leitmotif of our business since the 1970s. However, the number of startups would be even higher if we weren’t ejecting foreign-born students and if we welcomed their contemporaries who have been educated overseas. Today, it is impossible to satisfy Silicon Valley's appetite for engineers and scientists with people born in America.¶ The xenophobia underlying current immigration policy has three consequences for the U.S. technology industry. First, the know-how for all sorts of new companies is being expelled from America. Second, it makes it even harder to fill the job vacancies at existing U.S. based semiconductor, biotech, networking and software companies. Third, it means that University labs, which have sown the seeds for so many commercial breakthroughs of the past seventy-five years, are deprived of the young faculty members who can be counted on for bursts of inspiration and originality. In the massive global IQ competition, the United States is shooting itself in the foot.¶ Today – while the Internet has made it simple for companies to identify the most capable prospects anywhere in the world – it is harder than ever to obtain the necessary paperwork. At Stripe, a young payments company in San Francisco (where I am a Board Member), the founders are a pair of Irish brothers, the senior business executive was born in Honduras and 14 of its 23 engineers were born outside the United States. Stripe’s engineering department would be at least twice as large if we could get working papers for the programmers we are eager to hire. Unless we do something quickly, our nation’s hiring problem will get more acute as U.S. educational standards continue to decline while they improve elsewhere.

**Bioweapons**

**2NC General**

**Expanding high skilled immigration key to stop bioterror attack**

**Goldberg et al 2004** (Joseph E., Dorsey, Harry, Bartone, Paul, Ortman, Bill, Ashcraft, Paul, Burlingame, Stan, Carter, Anna L., Cofer, Robin D., Elwood, John, Guerts, Jim, Industry Studies 2004: Biotechnology, The Industrial College of the Armed Forces National Defense University)

Biotechnology has the potential to revolutionize all aspects of our daily of life over the next two decades, in much the same way information technology did during the previous two decades. Biotechnology is still an immature industry that has yet to reach its full potential, but it is already an important driver for the U.S. economy overall. It presents the U.S. with a tremendous opportunity to address many of the country’s most pressing defense, health, and economic issues. It also holds promise for improvement in global health and welfare but only to the degree that other nations are willing to utilize the technology and are successful in their respective biotechnology initiatives. Biotechnology is greatly affected by government investment in basic science, government regulation, and the government product approval processes. These factors drive a unique business model. The synergy between U.S. government policies and funding, academia, and the industrial base provides the U.S. with a unique competitive advantage and is a primary reason the U.S. has been able to quickly become the global leader in biotechnology. While the recent recession temporarily cooled the rapid growth of biotech industry, it did not stifle long-term growth in revenues or sales, nor prevent sustained long-term growth. Demographics and a geometric expansion of biotech applications will fuel the biotech market well into the coming century. The U.S. is the world leader in the biotechnology industry in all aspects – the number of companies, size of the research base, number of products and patents, and level of revenue. While the U.S. is the dominant player in today’s biotechnology market, other countries in general, and Asia in particular, are actively investing in government sponsored programs to increase their market share and reduce the US dominance overall. The U.S.’ future lead in biotechnology is threatened by a potential shortage of U.S. scientists and engineers, an increasing global demand for scientists, fewer U.S. college graduates in math and science, and tighter U.S. visa restrictions on foreign students and scientists. Unfortunately, biotechnology’s potential for improving the quality of life in the U.S. and the rest of the world is tempered by the risk of enemy or terrorist use of bioagents and/or bioweapons against the US or its allies. The potential dual use of biotechnology complicates the effort to craft effective non-proliferation policies and mitigate bio-weapons threats. As biotechnology continues to mature as a technology and industrial sector, policy makers at the U.S. and global level must continue to refine global non-proliferation and counter-proliferation regimes to ensure biotechnology’s potential for mis-use does not outweigh its ability to address the world’s most pressing needs.

**A bioweapons attack threatens human survival**

**Carpenter and Bishop 2009** (P. A., P. C., July 10, Graduate Program in Studies of the Future, School of Human Sciences and Humanities, University of Houston-Clear Lake, Houston, TX, USA, Graduate Program in Futures Studies, College of Technology, University of Houston, Houston, TX, USA. A review of previous mass extinctions and historic catastrophic events, ScienceDirect)

The flu of 1890, 1918–1919 Spanish flu, 1957 Asian flu, 1968 Hong Kong flu, and 1977 Russian flu all led to mass deaths. Pandemics such as these remain major threats to human health that could lead to extremely high death rates. The 1918 pandemic is believed to have killed 50 million people [27]. AIDS (HIV) has killed an estimated 23 million people from 1978 to 2001 [15]. And there have been numerous other incidents of diseases such as cholera, dysentery, influenza, scurvy, smallpox, typhus, and plague that have caused the deaths of many millions throughout history. Clearly, these **biological diseases are much greater threats to human survival than other natural or environmental disasters**. Because bacterium and viral strains experience antigenic shifts (which are small changes in the virus that happen continually over time, eventually producing new virus strains that might not be recognized by the body’s immune system), another devastating pandemic could appear at any time. It should also be noted that **the threat from biological weapons is quite real**. In fact, scientists from the former Soviet Union’s bioweapons program claim to have developed an antibiotic-resistant strain of the plague [26].

**Extinction**

**Trewavas 00** [Anthony, Institute of Cell and Molecular Biology – University of Edinburgh, “GM Is the Best Option We Have”, AgBioWorld, 6-5, <http://www.agbioworld.org/biotech-info/articles/biotech-art/best_option.html>]

But these are foreign examples; global warming is the problem that requires the UK to develop GM technology. 1998 was the warmest year in the last one thousand years. Many think global warming will simply lead to a wetter climate and be benign. I do not. Excess rainfall in northern seas has been predicted to halt the Gulf Stream. In this situation, average UK temperatures would fall by 5 degrees centigrade and give us Moscow-like winters. There are already worrying signs of salinity changes in the deep oceans. Agriculture would be seriously damaged and necessitate the rapid development of new crop varieties to secure our food supply. We would not have much warning. Recent detailed analyses of arctic ice cores has shown that the climate can switch between stable states in fractions of a decade. Even if the climate is only wetter and warmer new crop pests and rampant disease will be the consequence. GM technology can enable new crops to be constructed in months and to be in the fields within a few years. This is the unique benefit GM offers. The UK populace needs to much more positive about GM or we may pay a very heavy price. In 535A.D. a volcano near the present Krakatoa exploded with the force of 200 million Hiroshima A bombs. The dense cloud of dust so reduced the intensity of the sun that for at least two years thereafter, summer turned to winter and crops here and elsewhere in the Northern hemisphere failed completely. The population survived by hunting a rapidly vanishing population of edible animals. The after-effects continued for a decade and human history was changed irreversibly. But the planet recovered. Such examples of benign nature's wisdom, in full flood as it were, dwarf and make miniscule the tiny modifications we make upon our environment. There are apparently 100 such volcanoes round the world that could at any time unleash forces as great. And even smaller volcanic explosions change our climate and can easily threaten the security of our food supply. Our hold on this planet is tenuous. In the present day an equivalent 535A.D. explosion would **destroy** much of our **civilisation**. Only those with agricultural technology sufficiently advanced would have a chance at **survival**. Colliding asteroids are another problem that requires us to be forward-looking accepting that **technological advance may be the only buffer between us and annihilation.**

**2NC Russia**

**Expanding visas key to bioweapons security --- checks use of engineers pathogens**

**Brumfiel 3** (Geoff, Physical Science Correspondent – Nature Magazine, “Russia’s Bioweapons Labs: Still Out in the Cold”, Science, 423, 6-23)

**Collaborations between Western researchers and former Soviet bioweapons scientists could benefit both parties. But mistrust and bureaucracy are getting in the way**, says Geoff Brumfiel. In autumn 2001, three American researchers sped down a deserted two-lane road that cuts through the forests south of Moscow. They were travelling to Obolensk, once a secret city and home to one of the former Soviet Union's largest bioweapons research complexes — the State Research Center for Applied Microbiology. The researchers were part of a programme, funded by the Pentagon, that aims to keep Russia's former bioweapons scientists gainfully employed on useful projects. Despite the dilapidated surroundings in Obolensk, the visitors were enthused by the opportunities for collaboration. The crumbling concrete buildings "looked almost like a ghetto", recalls Rebecca Morton, a veterinary scientist at Oklahoma State University in Stillwater. But after two weeks, she had hatched a plan to work with Obolensk researcher Vitaly Pavlov on endemic Eurasian strains of Francisella tularensis. This bacterium causes tularaemia, a potentially fatal and extremely infectious disease that affects the liver, spleen, lungs and lymph nodes, which was studied at Obolensk because of its bioweapons potential. Morton's project, which would study the surface proteins on different strains of the bacterium in **an effort to develop strain-specific diagnostic tests, is exactly the sort of initiative that the programme is designed to support**. **But** almost 18 months down the line, she **is no nearer to getting** the project **under way**. Although her proposal has had positive peer review, the funding request is still winding its way through the Pentagon's bureaucracy. "I haven't spoken to Vitaly for a while, because I don't have much to tell him," says Morton. "It's a little embarrassing." Obstacle course Other researchers who hope to set up collaborations at the Obolensk centre and its sister facility, the State Research Center of Virology and Biotechnology, known as Vector, at Koltsovo near Novosibirsk in Siberia, are experiencing similar delays. Cultural differences, mistrust between Russia and the United States, and **bureaucratic obstacles** on both sides **are** all **conspiring to stall promising avenues of research**. After the demise of the Soviet Union in 1991, US funds flowed rapidly to former nuclear scientists and rocket engineers, with the goal of preventing them from accepting lucrative offers from countries eager to acquire an arsenal of ballistic nuclear weapons. But bioweaponeers were left out in the cold. The reason, according to Amy Smithson, a senior associate at the Henry L. Stimson Center — a security-policy think-tank in Washington DC — was that US officials lacked contacts inside the super-secret Soviet bioweapons network. "**The biological non-proliferation programme literally had to be started from scratch**," she says. As a result, more than half of the staff at Obolensk and Vector melted away during the 1990s — to where, no one knows for sure. Obolensk and Vector were two research powerhouses in a network of facilities spread throughout **the Soviet Union**, known collectively as 'Biopreparat'. This network **weaponized** diseases such as plague, **anthrax**, tularaemia, brucellosis **and smallpox**, behind the façade of a state-run pharmaceutical enterprise. **Scientists** at Obolensk and Vector even **genetically engineered bacteria to resist antibiotics**. In addition to the staff's expertise, the centres have containment labs for working on dangerous pathogens — the provision of which is currently a limiting factor in US plans to ramp up biodefence research. With Russia now suffering epidemics of diseases such as tuberculosis and AIDS, it stands to benefit from projects that would redirect the expertise at Obolensk and Vector to these problems. "Russia is a time bomb right now," says Ann Harrington, who studies options for reducing the threat of bioweapons at the National Defense University in Washington DC. "It has an enormous need for facilities that can support public health, and that can monitor and identify disease." In her former job as acting director of the US state department's Office of Proliferation Threat Reduction, Harrington helped to set up the programme that took Morton and her colleagues to Obolensk. The modus operandi of this scheme, funded by the US Department of Defense and administered by the US National Academies, is to build partnerships between Western academics and the former Soviet bioweapons establishment. A sister programme, run by the International Science and Technology Center (ISTC), a non-proliferation organization in Moscow funded in most part by the European Union, Japan and the United States, aims to pay for more extended visits by foreign scientists to former Soviet bioweapons labs (see '[Blazing the trail](http://www.nature.com.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/nature/journal/v423/n6941/box/423678a_BX1.html)'). Take your partners Under the National Academies scheme, researchers are paid to travel to Obolensk or Vector for up to two weeks in search of partnerships. If they find a Russian to work with, they draw up a proposal, which is reviewed by the US academies' National Research Council, and can win up to $10,000. The idea is that participants will then apply for further grants from the Pentagon, the ISTC or other non-proliferation bodies. Researchers selected for the first round of visits went to Russia in autumn 2001. "I had this idea that I could essentially extend my lab and also switch to interesting organisms that I wouldn't be able to study in the United States," says Konstantin Severinov, a microbiologist of Russian extraction who now works at Rutgers University in New Jersey. But so far, little progress has been made towards realizing the programme's potential. At a National Academies meeting in Washington DC last December, Severinov and Gregory Ebel, an immunologist with the New York State Department of Health in Slingerlands, expressed their frustration. Severinov, who studies viruses called phages that infect bacteria, said that his research at Obolensk has slowed to a crawl, and Ebel explained that both US and Russian customs officials were blocking transport of even the most simple equipment. The problems have several causes, but many stem from the secretive culture of Biopreparat. For decades, the network's scientists were cut off from the outside world, other Russian researchers and even each other. Unsurprisingly, they are not familiar with the grant writing, publication and peer review that underpins mainstream science. At higher levels, trust continues to be an issue. Many senior managers at Obolensk and Vector are veterans from the Soviet era and have a deep mistrust of the United States. They have almost absolute authority over their labs — determining what can flow to the West, and having an obligation to the Russian state to protect classified research. "Scientists may be convicted for giving state secrets to foreigners," says Ken Alibek, who served as deputy director of Biopreparat for five years before defecting to the United States in 1992. As a result of these attitudes, some US politicians complain that the Russian labs are simply trying to take cash handouts without opening themselves up to proper scrutiny. "We must ensure that the investment can be directly traced to an actual tangible reduction in military threats," the chair of the House of Representatives Armed Services Committee, Duncan Hunter (Republican, California), said at a hearing in January. Suspicions about the new schemes are heightened by the experience of earlier non-proliferation programmes established in the former Soviet Union, which have been plagued by corruption: lab administrators have been known to take a cut from each research grant at their facility. Today, financial checks are in place to prevent such abuses, but these also slow research. Following a congressional crackdown, for instance, there are now strict limits on how much of the funding can be spent by US researchers on projects in Russia. "We have some money for travel," says Bruce Scharf, a veterinary scientist at the State University of New York's Downstate Medical Center in Brooklyn, who is setting up a project to study rabies at Vector under the National Academies programme. "But I'm not paid a cent." Closed borders Perhaps **the most serious problems are** those **caused by** customs and **immigration restrictions**. **Especially since** the terrorist outrages of **11 September** 2001, and the anthrax attacks that followed, **the US customs service has enforced strict controls** on the import of biological material. As a result, Scharf has been unable to get the rabies samples he is studying at Vector into the United States. Similarly **tough regulations** on both the US and Russian sides **are preventing** Sergey Morzunov, **a Russian-born microbiologist** at the University of Nevada at Reno, **from sending even basic materials**, such as reagents for a DNA sequencing kit, to Vector. "The expiry date for my sequencing kit is May 2003, but it is still sitting on a shelf in the warehouse," Morzunov complains. **New immigration regulations have** also **stopped Russian partners in the programme from visiting the** **U**nited **S**tates **to build links with their new Western colleagues**, adds Vladimir Volkov, deputy director of the Obolensk facility. "**Getting a visa** for a business trip to the States **may now take over three months**," he says. **Given the** litany of **problems**, **Alibek doubts whether the programmes will do much to further the cause of non-proliferation** — especially as so many Obolensk and Vector staff drifted away in the 1990s. But other experts point to the vast expertise on biological warfare still present at the centres, and argue that it must be worth harnessing this knowledge. "I think the programme is still very much in its infancy," says Glenn Schweitzer, its coordinator at the US National Academies.

**Russian bioweapons cause extinction**

**Maartens 6** (Dr. Willie, Ph.D. – Business Economics and Management, Mapping Reality: A Critical Perspective on Science and Religion, p. 251-252)

The scientists are the ‘high priests of today’ and their beliefs, dogmas, et cetera, will influence the politicians, and other decision-makers more than most. **This situation might be the trigger to human extinction**, and more horribly the extinction of other innocent species as well. When human civilisation’s radio signals eventually reach the nearest star at the speed of light, our civilization might have extinguished itself by that time already. When it happens, it could happen very, very quickly. You just have to contemplate the mass of biological weapons that the former USSR has developed and stored on an Island in the Aral Sea to become extremely scared. Super-strains of Anthrax, that can even survive an atomic explosion, is but one of the known deadly strains.

**A2: No Bioterror**

**Huge risk of extinction – “Garage Biology” eliminated tech barriers**

**Gottlieb 13**

[Dr. Scott, practicing physician and a Resident Fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, “Ricin And The Risk Of Bioterror: Are We Prepared?” Forbes, 4/17, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/scottgottlieb/2013/04/17/ricin-domestic-bioterrorism-and-the-lessons-learned-after-9-11-are-we-safer-today-than-we-were-ten-years-ago/2/>]

In the future, **the bigger threat may come from the deliberate misuse of engineered organisms**. **These are biological agents that can be engineered to spread from person to person, like a deadly form of flu or a re-engineered version of smallpox.**¶ As I noted in a commentary in the Wall Street Journal, **DNA synthesizers for making weaponized bugs are small, cheap and easy to procure. The technical means** for harnessing these tools **is relatively straightforward**. The **instruction sets** for making these kinds of deadly organisms **can be found on the Internet**.¶ **Rogue regimes and lone villains could exploit these scientific methods for deadly aims**. **In the extreme, such an attack could** play like the creepy plot of the 1995 film “Twelve Monkeys,” where a wicked scientist engineers a virus that nearly **drive**s **mankind to extinction**.¶ **With the advent of what some have called “garage biology,” such scenarios are no longer wildly implausible.** **The most recent attacks only serve to reinforce the existence of evil motives that continue to search for these means of wicked ends**.

**Economy**

### 1NC Economy

#### Immigration reform key to prevent economic collapse

Milller 2/7 – former two-term elected Kentucky State Treasurer, Miller held several other senior positions in state and federal government, including serving in Kentucky Governor Steve Beshear’s Cabinet as Secretary of Finance and Administration, as Deputy Chief of Staff of the U.S. Department of Energy, and as Legislative Director for Congressman Jim Cooper (Jonathon, “Why Our Economy Demands Immigration Reform”, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/jonathanmiller/immigration-reform-economy_b_2639092.html>, CMR)

When it comes to restoring strong, long-term growth in our nation's economy, there are few solutions more practical, bi-partisan, and urgent than immigration reform.¶ Our current immigration system is rigid, outdated, and simply unable to keep up with demands of the new global marketplace. For our nation to thrive and transcend international competition in the 21st century economy, it is incumbent for us to build an immigration system that welcomes people who share our values, as well as the entrepreneurial spirit that has made our country great.¶ No one can doubt that we are a nation whose foundation was built by immigrants. But did you know that more than 40 percent of today's Fortune 500 companies were founded by an immigrant, or a child of an immigrant? Or that more than 75 percent of all the patents received by the top ten U.S. universities in 2011 had an immigrant inventor? While we celebrate our nation's first immigrants every Thanksgiving -- and while many of us cherish the stories shared by our own family members who made the pilgrimage to our shores -- we too often forget that today, and every day, recent immigrants continue to play a vital role in the American economy.¶ Unfortunately, far too often, our immigration policies drive too many foreign-born entrepreneurs and job creators away, even after we have trained them and given them degrees from American universities.¶ This is not simply a matter of compassion or human interest. This is about the very survival of our economy, way of life, and continued global leadership. We must make it easier for foreign-born, U.S.-educated students to get visas. We must create a startup visa program for entrepreneurs and innovators who want to come to our country to start businesses and hire American workers, especially when they already have U.S. investors to back their ideas. We must be doing everything we can to keep that capital in the U.S., rather than handing the next great idea over to our competitors.¶ Furthermore, with the enormous baby boomer generation set to retire, our current aging workforce simply cannot keep up with the demands. We need many more young workers, both in the high- and low-skilled areas of our economy. The U.S. government estimates that there are more than 3.5 million unfilled jobs in this country, even with high unemployment. Shortages are particularly high in industries with seasonal demands, like agriculture, landscaping, and hospitality. Many hotels and resorts across the country remain at half capacity, even during the busiest tourist seasons, simply because they cannot find enough workers to meet demands. We leave hundreds of millions of dollars in crops out in the fields because we can't hire enough workers to harvest them in time.¶ Unfortunately, our system is not structured in a way that accounts for the ebb and flow of our labor needs. We need a more flexible visa allotment system, and we need to expand the number of employment-based visas that are issued each year. Right now, only 7 percent of all green cards are distributed for employment based reasons, which is clearly far too low.¶ It is refreshing to see Congress take the initial steps to reform, and I applaud the bi-partisan Gang of Eight for taking a leadership role in these efforts and laying out sensible solutions. They have opened the door for a healthy debate. Now we need to make sure that Congress takes action and creates a more modern and reasonable immigration system for our country.¶ I will never forget the pride I felt when my wife -- the mother of our two incredible daughters -- was naturalized as a U.S. citizen. We must reform our system so that many more families can experience the joy she felt in becoming an American. And we must reform our system because their pride and joy results in a better economic climate and more job opportunity for all of our country.

**US economic collapse causes war and triggers every impact**

**O’Hanlon 12** — Kenneth G. Lieberthal, Director of the John L. Thornton China Center and Senior Fellow in Foreign Policy and Global Economy and Development at the Brookings Institution, former Professor at the University of Michigan, served as special assistant to the president for national security affairs and senior director for Asia on the National Security Council, holds a Ph.D. from Columbia University, and Michael E. O'Hanlon, Director of Research and Senior Fellow in Foreign Policy at the Brookings Institution, Visiting Lecturer at Princeton University, Adjunct Professor at Johns Hopkins University, holds a Ph.D. from Princeton University, 2012 (“The Real National Security Threat: America's Debt,” *Los Angeles Times*, July 10th, Available Online at http://www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2012/07/10-economy-foreign-policy-lieberthal-ohanlon, Accessed 07-12-2012)

Lastly, American economic weakness **undercuts U.S. leadership abroad**. Other countries **sense our weakness** and wonder about our purport 7ed decline. If this perception becomes more widespread, and the case that we are in decline becomes more persuasive, countries will begin to **take actions that reflect their skepticism about America's future**. Allies and friends will **doubt our commitment** and may **pursue nuclear weapons** for their own security, for example; adversaries will **sense opportunity** and be **less restrained in throwing around their weight** in their own neighborhoods. The crucial Persian Gulf and Western Pacific regions will likely become **less stable**. **Major war will become more likely**.

When running for president last time, Obama eloquently articulated big foreign policy visions: healing America's breach with the Muslim world, controlling global **climate change**, dramatically curbing **global poverty** through development aid, **moving toward a world free of** **nuclear weapons**. These were, and remain, worthy if elusive goals. However, for Obama or his successor, there is now **a much more urgent big-picture issue: restoring U.S. economic strength. Nothing else is really possible if that fundamental prerequisite to effective foreign policy is not reestablished**.

### 2NC Economy

#### Comprehensive reform key to US economic recovery

Garcia and Fitz 12/10 (Ann Garcia is a Research and Policy Associate for the Center for American Progress. Marshall Fitz is the Director of Immigration Policy at the Center, “Progressive Immigration Policies Will Strengthen the American Economy”, 2012, <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/immigration/news/2012/12/10/47406/progressive-immigration-policies-will-strengthen-the-american-economy/>, CR)

Immigrants have been a critical part of the American economy since the founding of our nation, but they are even more important today as we look to the future of our economic recovery and our economy. While Congress debates the economic strategy to restore our nation’s fiscal health, an opportunity is on the horizon that would maximize the human capital and talent of the nearly 40 million immigrants who call America home.¶ In order to reap the rewards of this talented and diverse labor pool, we must develop a legislative solution to fix our nation’s broken immigration system. Immigration reform that creates a pathway to earned legal status—and eventually to citizenship—for the undocumented immigrants living in our country while at the same time updating our legal immigration system will unleash the potential of immigrant workers and students to work, innovate, and add hundreds of billions of dollars to the U.S. economy.¶ Let’s review how progressive immigration policies can help make this happen.¶ Legalizing our nation’s undocumented immigrants¶ Legalizing the 11 million undocumented immigrants in the United States would add a cumulative $1.5 trillion to the U.S. gross domestic product—the largest measure of economic growth—over 10 years. That’s because immigration reform that puts all workers on a level playing field would create a virtuous cycle in which legal status and labor rights exert upward pressure on the wages of both American and immigrant workers. Higher wages and even better jobs would translate into increased consumer purchasing power, which would benefit the U.S. economy as a whole.¶ The federal government would accrue $4.5 billion to $5.4 billion in additional net tax revenue over just three years if the 11 million undocumented immigrants were legalized.¶ The national advantage of legalizing the undocumented immigrants is obvious in the previous figures, but gains are also evident at the state level. The state of Texas, for example, would see a $4.1 billion gain in tax revenue and the creation of 193,000 new jobs if its approximately 1.6 million undocumented immigrants were legalized.¶ States that have passed stringent immigration measures in an effort to curb the number of undocumented immigrants living in the state have hurt some of their key industries, which are held back due to inadequate access to qualified workers. A farmer in Alabama, where the state legislature passed the anti-immigration law H.B. 56 in 2011, for example, estimated that he lost up to $300,000 in produce in 2011 because the undocumented farmworkers who had skillfully picked tomatoes from his vines in years prior had been forced to flee the state.¶ With nearly half of agricultural workers, 17 percent of construction workers, and 12 percent of food preparation workers nationwide lacking legal immigration status, it isn’t hard to see why a legalization program would benefit a wide range of industries. Business owners—from farmers to hotel chain owners—benefit from reliable and skilled laborers. A legalization program would ensure that they have them.¶ Passing the DREAM Act¶ Passing the DREAM Act—legislation that proposes to create a roadmap to citizenship for immigrants who came to the United States as children—would put 2.1 million young people on a pathway to legal status, adding $329 billion to the American economy over the next two decades.¶ Legal status and the pursuit of higher education would create an aggregate 19 percent increase in earnings for DREAMers—young people who would benefit from passage of the DREAM Act—by 2030. The ripple effects of these increased wages would create $181 billion in induced economic impact, 1.4 million new jobs, and $10 billion in increased federal revenue.¶ Reforming the high-skilled immigration system¶ Creating a 21st century high-skilled immigration system—a system that accepts highly qualified immigrant workers when there is a demand that cannot be filled by American workers—would stimulate innovation, enhance competitiveness, and help cultivate a flexible, highly skilled U.S. workforce, while protecting American workers from globalization’s destabilizing effects.¶ The United States has always been and continues to be the nation where creative and talented individuals from around the world can come to realize their dreams, and our economy has significantly benefited from their innovation. In 2011 immigrant entrepreneurs were responsible for more than one in four new U.S. businesses, and immigrant businesses employ 1 in every 10 people working for private companies. Immigrants and their children founded forty percent of Fortune 500 companies. These Fortune 500 companies collectively generated $4.2 trillion in revenue in 2010—more than the GDP of every country in the world except the United States, China, and Japan. Reforms that enhance legal immigration channels for high-skilled immigrants and entrepreneurs while protecting American workers and placing all high-skilled workers on a level playing field will promote economic growth, innovation, and workforce stability in the United States.¶ Our economy has benefited enormously from the talented immigrants who come here to study. Upon graduation, however, immigrant students face the tough choice between returning home and finding an employer to sponsor their entry into a visa lottery that may allow them to stay and work. Reforming the high-skilled immigration system would allow us to reap the benefits of having subsidized the education and training of these future job creators as immigrant students graduate and go on to work at our nation’s companies, contributing directly and immediately to our nation’s competitiveness in the global market.¶ Significant reform of the high-skilled immigration system would benefit certain industries that require high-skilled workers, such as the high-tech manufacturing and information technology industries. Immigrants make up 23 percent of the labor force in both of these industries and are more highly educated, on average, than the native-born Americans working in these industries. Still, immigrants working in science, technology, engineering, and math fields in the United States complement, rather than compete with, American workers. For every immigrant who earns an advanced degree in one of these fields at a U.S. university, 2.62 American jobs are created. By focusing on drawing human capital to our country and retaining it, Congress can help ensure that key sectors of our economy have an adequate labor pool to draw from and can boost our collective economic potential.¶ Our economy has much to gain from reforming our broken immigration system. But the biggest rewards will only be realized if Congress approaches immigration reform as an economic opportunity to be seized rather than an enforcement problem to be solved. Legislation that deals comprehensively with the issue by putting the nation’s undocumented immigrants, including DREAMers, on a path to citizenship while also reforming the high-skilled immigration system will strengthen the nation’s economy while increasing prosperity for all Americans.

#### Biggest, quickest internal link

Hinojosa-Ojeda 12 – Founding Director of the North American Integration and Development Center at the University of California, Los Angeles

(Raúl, “The Economic Benefits of Comprehensive Immigration Reform”, Cato Institute, Winter, online,

The Economic Benefits of Comprehensive¶ Immigration Reform¶ The results of our modeling suggest that comprehensive immigration¶ reform would increase U.S. GDP by at least 0.84 percent¶ per year. Using 10-year GDP projections prepared by the¶ Congressional Budget Office, this translates into a steadily increasing¶ amount of added annual GDP over the coming decade. The¶ 10-year total is at least $1.5 trillion in added GDP, which includes¶ roughly $1.2 trillion in additional consumption and $256 billion in¶ additional investment.¶ Comprehensive immigration reform brings substantial economic¶ gains even in the short run—during the first three years following¶ legalization. The real wages of newly legalized workers increase by¶ roughly $4,400 per year among those in less-skilled jobs during the¶ first three years of implementation, and $6,185 per year for those in¶ higher-skilled jobs. The higher earning power of newly legalized¶ workers translates into an increase in net personal income of $30 billion¶ to $36 billion, which would generate $4.5 to $5.4 billion in additional¶ net tax revenue nationally, enough to support 750,000 to¶ 900,000 new jobs.¶ Ultimately, only the federal government can resolve the status of¶ the undocumented. But for the purposes of our analysis, we examine¶ what would happen on a state and county level if local workforces¶ were fully legalized through comprehensive immigration reform.¶ In California, which faces a $25.4 billion budget shortfall in¶ 2011–12, this scenario would lead to a $27 billion increase in labor¶ income (pre-tax salary and wage earnings) that would generate a¶ $5.3 billion boost in tax revenue for the state and add 633,000 desperately¶ needed jobs to the economy. In Los Angeles County, labor¶ income would increase $10 billion through legalization, leading to¶ $1.9 billion in additional net tax revenue and 211,000 new jobs. In¶ Arizona, the same legalization scheme would generate $5.6 billion¶ more in labor income, leading to $1.68 billion in tax revenue and an¶ additional 261,000 jobs.¶ The wages of native-born workers also increase under the comprehensive¶ immigration reform scenario because the “wage floor”¶ rises for all workers—particularly in industries where large numbers¶ of easily exploited, low-wage, unauthorized immigrants currently¶ work. Wages for native-born U.S. workers increase by roughly $162¶ per year for the less-skilled and $74 per year for the higher-skilled.¶ Under the temporary worker program scenario, wages fall for both¶ less-skilled and higher-skilled native-born U.S. workers. And under¶ the mass deportation scenario, wages for less-skilled native-born¶ workers actually rise, but only at the cost of significantly fewer jobs¶ as the economy contracts and investment declines. The cost of this¶ scheme to local economies, however, is staggering.¶ If California’s workforce were depleted by mass deportation, the¶ resulting contraction of the economy would mean a loss of $176 billion¶ in labor income and a reduction in gross product of $300 billion,¶ or 17 percent of the state economy. As a result, 3.6 million jobs would¶ be lost. Los Angeles County would be even harder hit, with the¶ $60.1 billion loss in labor income causing a 22 percent reduction in¶ the local economy and the loss of 1.2 million jobs. Arizona’s case is¶ almost as severe, with the $29.5 billion the state would lose in labor¶ income as a result of mass deportation and the $48.8 billion reduction¶ in gross product representing a 20 percent depletion of the¶ economy and the loss of 581,000 jobs.¶ The benefits of additional U.S. GDP growth under the comprehensive¶ immigration reform scenario are spread very broadly¶ throughout the U.S. economy, with virtually every sector expanding.¶ Particularly large increases occur in immigrant-heavy industries¶ such as textiles, ferrous metals, transportation equipment, electronic¶ equipment, motor vehicles and parts, nonelectric machinery and¶ equipment, capital goods, mineral products, and construction. In¶ comparison, every sector experiences significantly smaller gains¶ under the temporary worker scenario, while every sector contracts¶ under the mass deportation scenario.¶ Conclusion¶ The experience of IRCA and the results of our modeling both¶ indicate that legalizing currently unauthorized immigrants and creating¶ flexible legal limits on future immigration in the context of full¶ labor rights would raise wages, increase consumption, create jobs,¶ and generate additional tax revenue—particularly in those sectors of¶ the U.S. economy now characterized by the lowest wages. This is a¶ compelling economic reason to move away from the current “vicious¶ cycle” where enforcement-only policies perpetuate unauthorized¶ migration and exert downward pressure on already-low wages, and¶ toward a “virtuous cycle” of worker empowerment in which legal status¶ and labor rights exert upward pressure on wages.¶ Legalization of the nation’s unauthorized workers and new legal¶ limits on immigration that rise and fall with U.S. labor demand would¶ help lay the foundation for robust, just, and widespread economic¶ growth. Moving unauthorized workers out of a vulnerable underground¶ status strengthens all working families’ ability to become more¶ productive and creates higher levels of job-generating consumption,¶ thereby laying a foundation for long-term community revitalization,¶ middle-class growth, and a stronger, more equitable national economy.

#### Immigration reform would increase the availability of jobs and the wages paid for them; that would stimulate the economy

￼ Vanegas 7/8/13 (Maria Immigration Reform And The Economy: Current 2013 Bill Presents Opportunity To Boost Healthy Competition And Job Growth Latin Times www.latintimes.com/home/news/services/print.php?article\_id=6077

￼

The United States is defined as one of the top countries in the world because of its economic and financial wealth and also for the vast opportunities given to its large population of immigrants. The country's diversity is unique and combines individuals from across the globe. Since the beginning of the world economic and financial crisis in 2008, the need for more jobs has rapidly increased, making job hunting hard for American citizens, investments have declined, the stock markets have fallen, there has been a loss of businesses and less workers in Unions. Many opponents of immigration reform point to economic reasons of why they do not support the bill which recently passed in the Senate but faces a tough road ahead in the House. However, much of their reasoning can be refuted.¶ A Political History¶ For politicians, immigration reform has been political issue to appease certain voting demographics. Former President George W. Bush tried to take on reform by installing the "guest worker" proposal. Indeed it caused chaos due to border enforcements and a struggling economy, but throughout the past few years, since¶ ￼¶ ￼2001, more immigrants have left their countries for the American dream. In 2006, the Border Protection, Anti­terrorism and Illegal Immigration Control Act of 2005 was passed by the U.S. House of Representatives and later that year the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act was passed. Neither of these acts provided comprehensive reform. However, in 2009, when U.S. President Barack Obama began his first term, he brought immigration reform to the forefront of his¶ agenda. He started with the proposal of the DREAM Act, which was intended to help immigrant students who came from their country as a child, finished high school, had good grades and has lived in the U.S. for five plus years. This act did make it to Congress but it was not approved by the Republican Party.¶ Comprehensive immigration reform for the United States was proposed more than a decade ago, though it did not become a focus issue in Washington until President Barack Obama took office. Many opponents of reform believe that it would lead to an economic struggle, but on the contrary by giving immigrants their legal status, it would significantly aid the expansion of America's wealth, reported the New York Times. In the recent world economic and financial crisis, the U.S.'s unemployment rate increased tremendously. Recently it has been declining, but the country's economy is not at its complete recovery, yet. If immigration reform passes through the house, there will be a higher GDP due to the evolution of more jobs and the increase of production in various sectors.¶ According to PolicyMic there would be about 203,000 more jobs in America.¶ Pros of Immigration Reform¶ ­Serve as a large economic aid in various prospects.¶ ­Larger labor force with welfare benefits for all employees.¶ ­Entrepreneurship would increase and help industrialize the nation more. ­Make the U.S. even more competitive among other large industries worldwide.¶ Cons of Immigration Reform¶ ­Increase in population¶ ­Fear of native­born Americans of losing their jobs¶ ­Large expense to give legal status to all undocumented in the U.S.¶ Will The U.S. Benefit Economically From Immigration Reform?¶ If immigration reform is a great economic aid, what are opponents of reform¶ concerned about? According to the Heritage Foundation, the problem with giving amnesty to undocumented immigrants living in the U.S. is there are many individuals living in their country waiting for their American citizenship (apart from those already in the country illegally). A larger population creates fear in opponents of reform because they believe that current native­born¶ Americans may lose their jobs, but an immigration expert, Alex¶ Nowrasteh, calls this fear "a silly thing." Nowrasteh along with others state that immigration reform will not take jobs away from anyone. Instead, with more employees there would be higher pay for all. On the other hand, if reform were to pass in Congress, opponents are aware that competition would rise but to them that is an issue.¶ As President Barack Obama took office in 2009, American Unions were in complete opposition to a reform of immigration because they assumed that immigrants would only lead companies to a loss of profit and competition, and create welfare issues for all employees. Now that reform has become more¶ ￼influential in Washington, all Unions want the immigration¶ reform approved by Congress. Unions believe that with documented immigrants, American manufacturing businesses will be able to return from overseas and even create new ones. With unions on immigrants' side they would be provided all working benefits, which include higher pay, health insurance and guaranteed pensions. More jobs mean more income for all employees and richer businesses and of course a wealthier economy. More importantly competition would evolve and make the U.S. more industrialized in many sectors, such as manufacturing and agriculture. As opponents believe competition to be bad, in reality it is a very good thing. Competition does not only lead to more workers but larger and wealthier entities, which would certainly make America more powerful in various sectors around the globe.¶ The amount of 11 million immigrants would greatly aid the nation's economy by declining unemployment, making unions larger and building new businesses.¶ The creation of more jobs would come from¶ entrepreneurship, which would enlarge, and it would rather give than take away jobs. This would create more economic sectors that would provide benefits to all its workers and increase income per capita, which would¶ increase GDP to about $1.4 trillion USD from $832¶ billion USD. Immigration reform would generate the implementing of¶ 121,000 jobs annually for a decade, with those given a green card. Getting citizenship within five years would increase the number of jobs to 159,000 per year. If the reform were to pass, immigrants with their new legal status would create 203,000 jobs.¶ As reform is yet to be approved in the Senate, activists will continue to fight for immigration reform and a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants. Of course with the help of many, including all American Unions, immigration reform may be approved for economic reasons, but surely, like other immigration acts, there will be limitations.

#### Immigration Reform is key to the economy

Ewing 12 (Ph.D., is the Senior Researcher at the Immigration Policy Center. He has authored or co-authored 20 reports and opinion pieces for the IPC, A Growing Consensus on Supporting Immigration Reform, <http://immigrationimpact.com/2012/10/18/a-growing-consensus-on-supporting-immigration-reform/#sthash.Z84ZvWLv.dpuf>, ME)

Immigration reform is not a “liberal” cause; it is a common-sense cause that appeals to people from a variety of political persuasions. More than a few conservative intellectuals, commentators, politicians, religious leaders, and law-enforcement officials favor revamping the U.S. immigration system to make it more responsive to the economic demands, social realities, and security concerns of the 21st century. This stance represents not only compassion, but enlightened self-interest. A growing body of evidence has quantified the enormous contributions that immigrants make to the U.S. economy through their labor, entrepreneurship, buying power, and innovation. Moreover, demographic trends point clearly to the growing electoral power of naturalized immigrants and to the native-born children of immigrants. In other words, being anti-immigrant in this day and age is self-destructive from both an economic and a political standpoint.¶ A growing body of evidence has quantified the enormous contributions that immigrants make to the U.S. economy through their labor, entrepreneurship, buying power, and innovation.¶ The common cause that conservatives and progressives can make when it comes to the subject of immigration reform is epitomized by Forging a New Consensus on Immigrants and America, a project of the National Immigration Forum. On October 12, Forging a New Consensus organized a Midwest Summit which featured conservative activist Grover Norquist, who declared that “immigration is the most important thing to focus if you’re concerned about America as an economic power. Not only is it good policy to have dramatically more immigrants in the U.S. than we do today and a path for those who are here; it’s also good politics. In fact, restrictionist policies are bad electoral policies.”¶ Norquist’s stance on immigration and immigration reform is seconded by a number of conservative economic experts. For instance, the Winter 2012 issue of the Cato Journal is devoted to answering the fundamental question of whether or not immigration is good for the United States. The consensus of the scholars writing for the journal is that, yes, immigration does provide a net benefit to the U.S. economy and to U.S. workers. Moreover, the consensus is that the current immigration system, with its arbitrary numerical caps, needlessly squanders the full economic potential of immigration. The authors call for revamping the immigration system to make it more responsive to labor demand, attract highly skilled professionals and entrepreneurs, and offer a pathway to legal status for unauthorized immigrants.¶ In the words of Daniel T. Griswold, former Director of the Herbert A. Stiefel Center for Trade Policy Studies at the Cato Institute, “basic economic analysis and numerous empirical studies have confirmed that immigrants boost the productive capacity of the United States through their labor, their human capital, and their entrepreneurial spirit. Instead of competing head-to-head with American workers, immigrants typically complement native-born workers by filling niches in the labor market.”¶ If some conservatives are challenging conservative orthodoxy by viewing immigrants and immigration in a favorable light, they are not alone. A new survey by the Chicago Council on Global Affairs found that “over the last decade Americans have grown less concerned about large numbers of immigrants—legal or illegal—coming to live and work in the United States.” In fact, “a growing number of Americans support keeping legal immigration at its current level or increasing it.” Moreover, “for the first time since the question was first asked by the Council in 1994, only a minority (40%) of Americans consider a large influx of immigrants and refugees a ‘critical threat’ to the United States.”¶ Anti-immigrant demagoguery will win fewer and fewer votes as time goes on. And anti-immigrant demagoguery will do nothing to help the U.S. economy recover. Some conservatives have recognized these facts and become more open to immigration as an economic resource and to immigrants as engines of the economy. But other conservatives cling to the time-honored tactic of using immigrants as scapegoats for every economic or social ill to afflict the United States. Ultimately, these old-style conservatives are destined for demographic extinction.¶ - See more at:

### 2NC Economy – Turns Case

#### Economic decline turns the case – focus

Whitehead & Nolte 12 (Laurence Whitehead, senior research fellow in politics at Nuffield College, Oxford, and Detlef Nolte, acting president of the GIGA, director of the GIGA Institute of Latin American Studies, professor of political science at the University of Hamburg, Number 6, 2012, <http://www.giga-hamburg.de/dl/download.php?d=/content/publikationen/pdf/gf_international_1206.pdf>, CMR)

Two years into Obama’s first term, researchers at the Brookings Institution revisited some ¶ of these ideas in light of the developments that ¶ had taken place so far (Lowenthal, Piccone, and ¶ Whitehead 2010). While the emphasis and interpretations of the various contributors differed, ¶ there was a general recognition that most of these ¶ initial hopes had been set too high. Symptomatic of this was the fact that the promise to close ¶ Guantanamo prison had not been honored, and ¶ that, after no more than the briefest of pauses, the ¶ “ALBA” group, led by President Chávez, had resumed its negative discourse. Obviously, the ¶ gravity of the economic crisis facing the incoming ¶ president had absorbed most of his energies, and ¶ in the foreign policy domain continuing and severe security challenges in Iraq, Afghanistan and ¶ elsewhere in the Muslim world had necessarily taken priority over less urgent Western Hemisphere concerns. On the domestic political front ¶ the new president had run into ferocious opposition to his healthcare reforms, and a deeply polarized internal climate had drastically reduced his ¶ room for maneuver on peripheral issues.

#### Growth solves the case – pre-requisite to securing leadership and increased engagement

Whitefield 11/7/12 (Mimi, and Tim Johnson, “Will Latin America become a higher priority during second Obama term?”, <http://www.miamiherald.com/2012/11/07/v-fullstory/3086849/will-latin-america-become-a-higher.html>, CMR)

The president should concentrate on getting the U.S. economy back on track because “that is the best thing we could do for Latin America’’ in terms of spurring trade and investment, said Eric Farnsworth, vice president of the Americas Society/Council of the Americas.¶ “From a national security perspective, it’s very obvious we have to show the world we are capable of getting our house in order if we’re going to inspire confidence in America’s continuing role in the world,’’ Robert Kagan, a senior fellow at Brookings Institution, said Wednesday during a forum at the Washington think tank.

**Econ IL – CIR**

**Newest studies**

**Huffington Post, 2-7**-2013 <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/02/07/economic-benefits-of-immigration-reform_n_2638548.html>

The infographic predicts that **c**omprehensive **i**mmigration **r**eform **would provide** **a $1.5 trilion benefit to the GDP** **over 10 years**, **along with a $66 billion boost in federal tax collection**. **Those** figures would **more than offset** the **potential costs** of the same.¶ The Financialist modeled its projections on the 2006 comprehensive immigration reform proposal and based the graphic on information from the Congressional Budget Office and a 2010 study by Raúl Hinojosa-Ojeda for the Immigration Policy Center and the Center for American Progress.¶ The digital publication isn't the only one trying to move the immigration debate beyond social issues into the economic realm. **Conservative New York Times columnist** David **Brooks** **said** in a piece last month that reform **advocates should** drop the humanitarian argument and instead **focus on the economic one:¶** The forlorn pundit doesn’t even have to make the humanitarian case that immigration reform would be a great victory for human dignity. **The** cold **economic case by itself is so strong**.¶ **Increased immigration** **would boost the U.S. economy**. **Immigrants are 30 percent more likely to start new** **businesses** than native-born Americans, according to a research summary by Michael Greenstone and Adam Looney of The Hamilton Project. **They** are **more likely to earn patents**. **A quarter of new high-tech companies** with more than $1 million in sales **were** also **founded by the foreign-born**.

**-Consensus**

Ted **Hesson** is the immigration editor for Univision News. 11-19-**2012** <http://abcnews.go.com/ABC_Univision/News/analysis-economic-impact-immigration-reform/story?id=17761157#.UUvQXldvCuq>

1. "The Economic Benefits of **C**omprehensive **I**mmigration **R**eform" by UCLA professor Raúl Hinojosa-Ojeda, published by the Cato Institute, a libertarian think tank¶ Summary: Immigration reform would add $1.5 trillion to the U.S. gross domestic product (GDP) over 10 years.¶ This report looks at three scenarios projected over a 10-year period: comprehensive reform, a guest worker program and mass deportation.¶ - Comprehensive reform would include a pathway to citizenship for undocumented immigrants who register, pay a fine and pass a criminal background check. That would add $1.5 trillion to the GDP over 10 years.¶ - A temporary worker program with no path to citizenship would add $792 million to the GDP, about half as much as reform.¶ - Mass deportation would result in $2.6 trillion in lost GDP over 10 years.¶ How does Hinojosa-Ojeda get these numbers?¶ He starts by looking at the last large-scale legalization program in the United States. That would be the 1986 amnesty under President Ronald Reagan. Via this program, nearly 3 million undocumented immigrants became lawful residents. The post-amnesty data -- which looks at a minimum period of three years, between 1988 and 1991 -- showed that legalization boosted wages for undocumented workers.¶ He then takes the wage increase experienced after the 1986 amnesty by this group and applies that to the number of people projected to seek legalization this time around. In Hinojosa-Ojeda's version of comprehensive reform, the immigration system is also adjusted so that the flow of immigrant workers entering the country during the 10-year period his report covers are doing so legally. He adds the higher wages that those legal workers would receive to his projection. "What you get are these very powerful increases in wages for the legalized population and the existing population," Hinojosa-Ojeda says.¶ This approach has its limitations, according to Laura Hill, a policy fellow at the Public Policy Institute of California (see her report below). The economic conditions of the late 1980s and early 1990s aren't the best indicator for predicting the impact in the present day, she says. "The world might have changed since 1986," Hill says. "That doesn't mean there wouldn't be any gains from legalization, it's just not the same magnitude of Hinojosa's work." ¶ To find out how the wage gains would affect the GDP, Hinojosa-Ojeda used an economic model called a computable general equilibrium model -- essentially a super calculator. This program incorporates 20,000 to 30,000 equations and is also used by the U.S. government to determine figures like the potential impact of tax revenue.¶ These types of programs can cost hundreds of thousands of dollars to develop: "This is for when you absolutely have to have the best results," Hinojosa-Ojeda said. While the tool is high power, what's more important is the data that you put in.¶ Hinojosa-Ojeda chose to use data from the last mass legalization program, which showed big wage increases. He also made the assumption that a better functioning immigration system would allow new immigrant workers to start at a higher salary. That all translates to big GDP gains over 10 years.¶ Verdict: **Economists generally agree** that a path to legalization would have a positive economic impact, but putting an exact dollar amount on that impact requires making some assumptions along the way. If the assumptions Hinojosa-Ojeda has made about the effects of reform hold true, the projection should be roughly on target.

**Econ IL – Visas/High Skilled**

**Expanding high skilled immigration key to US economic growth and competitiveness**

Anthony F. **Siliato**, Esq. **and** Scott R. **Malyk**, Esq, founder and associate of Meyner and Landis LLP’s Immigration Law Group, July 29, **2009**, “H-1B Visa Usage On The Decline: Is It The Economy Or Increased USCIS Scrutiny Or Something More?” <http://blogs.ilw.com/h1bvisablog/2009/07/h-1b-visa-usage-on-the-decline-is-it-the-economy-or-increased-uscis-scrutiny-or-something-more.html>

**As a result of the H-1B “crackdown”, a recent** Computer World **article predicts that more and more Indian IT firms will look to alternate locations to the United States**, including Mexico, **which are more immigration friendly** and less costly. **Hence the query: Is this downward trend of H-1B usage an aberration or will we see this trend continue? Most assuredly, a confluence of factors have contributed to the recent trend**—a struggling economy, compounded by the current naysayer attitude of USCIS and the fact that the United States is becoming less and less attractive to an immigrant workforce that has historically helped to stimulate our economy. **While there is little doubt that we can expect some increase in H-1B usage as our economy recovers, there is no doubt that the United States has lost some of its glitter to the best and brightest of the world**. Now **prospects are becoming dimmer for highly skilled professional immigrants under the H-1B program**. Regardless of the empirical data upon which one relies, **it is undisputed that the shifting of nonimmigrant personnel offshore is a damaging blow to our overall economic recovery and to the United States’ dominance in the areas of medicine, science, engineering and technology**. One such set of data is set forth in a recent position paper published by the Harvard Business School which finds that invention increases with higher H-1B admission levels. **In finding that the H-1B visa program for temporary workers has played an important role in U.S. innovation patterns and technological commercialization** over the last 15 years, **the authors conclude that the H-1B program is a matter of significant policy importance and that “total invention increases with higher admission levels primarily through the direct contributions of immigrant inventors**”. **It naturally follows that, as invention and innovation are on the rise, so are employment opportunities for U.S. workers**. This begs the question that if we cede to certain isolationist sentiments and ideas in the name of “protecting U.S. workers,” are we simply cutting off our nose to spite our face? **The U.S. scientific, engineering, and technology industries cannot expect to maintain their present position of international leadership if we continue to create legislative** and administrative **obstacles that discourage the hiring and retention of highly educated foreign talent**. **We also cannot hope to grow our economy and create more jobs if we are ceding leadership in innovation to other nations**. Indeed, Google, one of the most innovative companies in the world, has said that it could not develop its innovations in the United States without the assistance of the H-1B workers program. In a hearing last year before the House Judiciary Immigration Subcommittee Laszlo **Block**, Vice President for People Operations at Google, **testified, “If U.S. employers are unable to hire those who are graduating from our universities, foreign competitors will.”** **Comprehensive immigration reform is clearly necessary with a realization by Congress that current restrictions on high skill immigration are counterproductive**. Otherwise, not only will some of the best graduates of our universities, and highly qualified scientists and researchers of the world, have no choice to live and work elsewhere, but more and more U.S. companies may follow the lead of IT consulting companies and vacate the United States to set up facilities offshore—all of which, of course, does not bode well for the health of our national economy.

**Increasing H-1B visas crucial to US competitiveness and economic growth.**

Courtney L. **Cromwell**, J.D. candidate, Brooklyn Law School, Spring **2009**, Brooklyn Journal of Corporate, Financial & Commercial Law, Lexis Academic

In addition to the high demand for workers, proponents remind us that the H-1B visa enables the world's best and brightest to come to the **U**nited **S**tates, allowing it to maintain its status as a leading innovative economy. n171 "In today's knowledge-based economy, capturing value from intellectual capital and knowledge-based assets has gained even more importance. Global competition is no longer for the control of raw materials, but for this productive knowledge." n172 If the cap remains at 65,000 and companies are not able to hire the workers they need, there will be severely detrimental effects on the U.S. economy. More companies will begin off-shoring their operations to more immigration-friendly nations such as Canada, Germany and the United Kingdom, or to countries where labor is less expensive. n173 Furthermore, fewer foreign nationals will enroll in U.S. universities because they will have no hope of remaining in the **U**nited **S**tates after graduation. n174 While all agree that the H-1B category needs reform, proponents argue that the protections mandated by the USCIS are taken seriously and that critics over-exaggerate the abuse of the category. n175

**Employment-based immigration key to growth.**

Paschal O. **Nwokocha**, former Minnesota assistant attorney general who is now chairman of Minnesota/Dakotas Chapter of American Immigration Lawyers Association, **2008**, William Mitchell Law Review, Lexis Academic

Many indicators suggest that receiving countries, and in this case the United States, benefit currently from employment-based immigration and will continue to do so in the future. n199 In 2006, immigrants made up 12.5 percent of the population, or 37.4 million people in the United States. n200 In economic terms alone, the **U**nited **S**tates has measurably profited from employment-based immigration; a recent report produced by Goldman Sachs states that overall economic output slows as the American labor force grows more slowly, and that new migrants have added approximately 0.5 percent to American **g**ross **d**omestic **p**roduct every year in the past decade. n201 Skilled immigrants supplement an aging and shrinking American workforce; they are entrepreneurs who create jobs and wealth, consumers of goods and services, and skilled workers whose large numbers encourage capital business investment. n202 Employment-based immigrants also pay taxes in the United States. n203 A study by the National Research Council points out that migrants with more than a high school education generate a net fiscal benefit of $ 198,000 over their lifetime. n204 Immigrant labor also helps keep the American economy stable because, [\*64] during strong growth periods, immigrants lower "the risk of wage pressures and rising inflation." n205 If growth slows, migrants often choose to move home, to migrate to another country, or not to migrate initially. n206

**It’s a question of perception – the US needs to counter-act the image of restricting high-skill immigrants – key to competitiveness.**

National Academy of Sciences (**NAS**), Committee on Prospering in the Global Economy of the 21st Century: An Agenda for American Science and Technology Committee on Science, Engineering, and Public Policy, **2007**, Rising Above the Gathering Storm: Energizing and Employing America for a Brighter Economic Future, http://www.nap.edu/catalog/11463.html

The federal government should continue to improve visa processing for international students and scholars to provide less complex procedures, and continue to make improvements on such issues as visa categories and duration, travel for scientific meetings, the technology alert list, reciprocity agreements, and changes in status. Since 9/11, the nation has struggled to improve security by more closely screening international visitors, students, and workers. The federal government is now also considering tightening controls on the access that international students and researchers have to technical information and equipment. One consequence is that fewer of the best international scientists and engineers are able to come to the United States, and if they do enter the United States, their intellectual and geographic mobility is curtailed. The post-9/11 approach fosters an image of the United States as a less than welcoming place for foreign scholars. At the same time, the home nations of many potential immigrants—such as China, India, Taiwan, and South Korea—are strengthening their own technology industries and universities and offering jobs and incentives to lure scientists and engineers to return to their nations of birth. Other countries have taken advantage of our tightened restrictions to open their doors more widely, and they recruit many who might otherwise have come to the United States to study or conduct research. A growing challenge for policy-makers is to reconcile security needs with the flow of people and information from abroad. Restrictions on access to information and technology—much of it already freely available— could undermine the fundamental research that benefits so greatly from international participation. One must be particularly vigilant to ensure that thoughtful, high-level directives concerning homeland security are not unnecessarily amplified by administrators who focus on short-term safety while unintentionally weakening long-term overall national security. Any marginal benefits in the security arena have to be weighed against the ability of national research facilities to carry out unclassified, basic research and the ability of private companies with federal contracts to remain internationally competitive. An unbalanced increase in security will erode the nation’s scientific and engineering productivity and economic strength and will destroy the welcoming atmosphere of our scientific and engineering institutions. Such restrictions would also add to the incentives for US companies to move operations overseas.

**Increasing high-skill immigration key to boost job creation.**

Richard T. **Herman and** Robert L. **Smith**, founder of Richard T. Herman & Associates, an immigration and business law firm and veteran journalist who has written extensively on immigration, August 3, **2010**, AOL News, “Opinion: The Immigration Solution to Job Growth,” http://www.aolnews.com/opinion/article/opinion-heres-a-quick-and-cheap-way-to-create-jobs-welcome-more-skilled-immigrants/19578143

Some people need a new job. Some people need any job. The question being asked across America these days goes something like, "Where will the new jobs come from?" Will they come from big corporations? From the government? Will they fall from the sky? Some people seem to think so. How else to explain their reluctance to embrace the most powerful economic stimulus of the era -- immigration. The fact is, new jobs in the new economy are powered by startups -- businesses started by entrepreneurs. And much of the entrepreneurial fuel in this country comes from immigrants. According to a recent study by the Kauffman Foundation, nearly all net job growth in America from 1980 to 2005 came from companies less than 5 years old. That's an astonishing and powerful statistic. When people envision major employers, many still think of huge companies and their factories, banks and law firms and retail chains. How many think of a small business with a marketable idea and an owner with zeal? In the 25-year span studied by the Kauffman Foundation, new companies created 40 million new jobs. And here's the sobering observation: "That means the established firms created no new net jobs during that period," Robert Litan, the foundation's research director, reported to a U.S. congressional committee in June. A quick and cheap way to kick-start the entrepreneurial engine: Welcome skilled immigrants to town. In researching our book, "Immigrant Inc.," we were struck by the fact that where immigrants settled, economies bloomed. Where immigrants were absent, little happened. Immigrants today, like immigrants of old, tend to be strivers and dreamers. Add to that an advanced degree in science or engineering, which many of them possess, and wonders happen. Compared with native-born citizens, America's immigrants are nearly twice as likely to start a company and twice as likely to be awarded a U.S. patent. They are probably the most prolific entrepreneurs on the planet. Nowhere is the power of immigrant entrepreneurs more obvious than in technology clusters. High-skilled, entrepreneurial immigrants founded or co-founded more than half of the high-tech companies in Silicon Valley and about a quarter of the biotech companies in New England. "Silicon Valley is full of immigrants," said Peter Rea, director of the Center for Innovation and Growth at Baldwin-Wallace College in suburban Cleveland. "They are much more likely to start and grow companies."

**Econ IL – Innovation**

**Innovation is the crucial variable for competitiveness – outweighs any link arguments.**

**Newsweek**, July 10, **2010**, <http://www.newsweek.com/2010/07/10/how-to-build-again.html>

**The report surveyed 400 global CEOs, tallying their views on the key factors that drive manufacturing competitiveness**. **The most surprising finding is that it’s innovation, not how cheap or expensive labor is, that determines whether a country will be successful in manufacturing**. **Contrary to conventional wisdom, manufacturing has not become a race to the bottom.** That’s why the U.S. still ranks as the fourth-most competitive nation after China, India, and South Korea, despite vastly higher labor costs. Germany, Japan, and Singapore also hold positions in the top 10. The skill levels of their workers more than offset their costs (U.S. workers are twice as productive as those in the next 10 leading manufacturing economies). **Skills are particularly critical in the lucrative high-end manufacturing sector, which accounts for about half of all new innovation within an economy. “Talent will be the oil of the 21st century,” says** Council on Competitiveness president Deborah L. **Wince-Smith**. On the other hand, oil is also the new oil—cost of energy and materials ranked third, right after talent and wages, as a determining factor in where to locate manufacturing operations. That’s bad news for America. Unlike China and many nations in Europe, the U.S. has no coherent national energy policy, and has yet to spark a green-jobs revolution. **The international CEOs surveyed believed that America would drop a spot in the competitiveness rankings within five years. There are measures the United States can take to shore up its position,** though predictably, they aren’t easy. While it’s not politically correct to suggest that perhaps every citizen shouldn’t aspire to a university degree, high-end technical schools that can turn a $16,000-a-year dishwasher into a $60,000-a-year welder may in fact deserve as much private and public money as mediocre four-year liberal-arts colleges churning out students with relatively useless degrees. That idea has worked in Germany, though the Germans have also done a good job producing top-level engineers—another area where the United States lags. A much stronger K–12 focus on math and science would help the U.S. greatly. **Immigration policy can also play a key role in ensuring competitiveness. As** Secretary of Commerce Gary **Locke points out, “So many firms that we view as American icons were actually started by immigrant**s.” It’s an oft-quoted fact, but one worth remembering as the Obama administration struggles to push through meaningful immigration reform. (This writer is for stapling a green card to the diploma of every foreign student who obtains a Ph.D. in the States.) After all, **the most talented people in the world now have other places to seek work**—namely their own countries, which will be the source of the majority of the world’s new jobs in the foreseeable future. **If talent really is the new oil, it will pay to keep it here**.

**A2: Piecemeal Solves**

**Dems would never agree to break it up**

**LAHT**- Latin America Herald Tribune, **2-7**-2013 <http://www.laht.com/article.asp?ArticleId=675450&CategoryId=12395>

**Democratic Senate leaders said** Thursday that **they will not accept anything less than** a **comprehensive** immigration **reform** plan **that allows for** the legalization and eventual attainment of **citizenship** for the 11 million undocumented immigrants in the United States.¶ At a roundtable with Spanish-language media, Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid and other senators involved in the negotiations for immigration reform said that they will avoid the mistakes of 2006 when an earlier reform attempt failed.¶ “**This notion that we can have a comprehensive bill and not include a path to citizenship is unacceptable**,” **said** Sen. Dick **Durbin**, one of the “Gang of Eight” pushing a bipartisan reform plan.¶ **He responded to comments** from Republicans suggesting **immigration reform be undertaken in stages** and that the issue of citizenship be left for last.

**Big-gulp approach key- needed to reach compromise and narrow window of opportunity**

Dan **Nowicki** The Republic | azcentral.com **2-9**-2013 <http://www.azcentral.com/news/politics/articles/20130201immigration-reform-deal.html?nclick_check=1>

**Champions of immigration reform are thinking big** **with this year’s** proposed **bipartisan** **overhaul: a** massive **bill that would impose** the most **sweeping changes** to the nation’s broken border system in more than a generation.¶ Capitol Hill **lawmakers** **involved in negotiations say the big-gulp approach is necessary** **to strike a compromise** **between** camps that passionately hold **different priorities** on immigration.¶ **Experts argue that, besides being politically expedient, a holistic plan is needed** to bring the out-of-date U.S. immigration system into the 21st century.¶ But **such a far-reaching** omnibus **bill could be difficult** to implement, with unforeseen expenses and unintended consequences, in addition to political pitfalls that could imperil passage. And even if it’s put into effect smoothly, advocates who envision reducing illegal immigration to a relative trickle, compared with the peak flows of the late 1990s and early 2000s, acknowledge that it and some related problems probably never will go away entirely.¶ “Big issues have big bills,” said Rep. Ed Pastor, D-Ariz., the senior member of the state’s House delegation. “The objective is to have a comprehensive bill because you want to ensure that you have all the components — border security, a pathway to legalization, visa improvements, maybe a guest-worker program — because in a way they’re all intertwined. You gain support and you gain opposition, but also it provides the opportunity to make deals and to compromise.”¶ It’s not uncommon for Congress to put off problematic issues for years before addressing them in one fell swoop. President Barack Obama’s 2010 health-care law is perhaps the best-known recent example.¶ Sometimes it takes public pressure that comes with a national crisis or scandal, such as the Enron Corp. debacle of the early 2000s, which led to a battery of new accounting regulations. Tide-turning elections that shifted control of Congress to the Democrats in 2006 and control of the House back to Republicans in 2010 add to a sense that once in power neither side has enough time to tend to big issues through a series of smaller-scale bills, even if they were so inclined.¶ **The window of opportunity for Obama** and his bipartisan allies on immigration **is narrow**, **which is another** **argument to strike fast with a single comprehensive piece of legislation**. But that also raises expectations and could make a failure that much more spectacular.

**Only way to keep everyone on board**

**Helderman and Nakamura 1/25**, Rosalind S. Helderman covers Congress and politics for the Washington Post, staff writer for The Washington Post “Senators nearing agreement on broad immigration reform proposal,” 1/25, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/senators-nearing-agreement-on-broad-immigration-reform-proposal/2013/01/25/950fb78a-6642-11e2-9e1b-07db1d2ccd5b_story.html>

But **obstacles abound**. For instance, Rubio has said he thinks immigrants who came to the country illegally should be able to earn a work permit but should be required to seek citizenship through existing avenues after those who have come here legally. Many Democrats and immigration advocates fear Rubio’s approach would result in wait-times stretching for decades, creating a class of permanent legal residents for whom the benefits of citizenship appear unattainable. They have pushed to create new pathways to citizenship specifically available to those who achieve legal residency as part of a reform effort. It is not yet clear whether the Senate group will endorse a mechanism allowing such people to eventually become citizens — something Obama is expected to champion. Schumer said it would be “relatively detailed” but would not “get down into the weeds.” A source close to Rubio said he joined the group in December at the request of other members only after they agreed their effort would line up with his own principles for reform. As a possible 2016 presidential contender widely trusted on the right, Rubio could be key to moving the bipartisan effort. Rubio and other Republicans have said they would prefer to split up a comprehensive immigration proposal into smaller bills that would be voted on separately, but the White House will pursue comprehensive legislation that seeks to reform the process in a single bill. “I doubt if there will be a macro, comprehensive bill,” said Sen. Johnny Isakson (R-Ga.), who supported the 2007 effort. “Anytime a bill’s more than 500 pages, people start getting suspicious. If it’s 2,000 pages, they go berserk.” But Schumer said Friday that **a single package will be key for passage**. **“We’ll not get it done in pieces,”** he said. “**Every time you do a piece, everyone says what about my piece, and you get more people opposing it.” E**liseo Medina, secretary treasurer of the Service Employees International Union, which spent millions recruiting Hispanic voters last year, said immigration advocates **expect Obama to be out front on the issue.** “**The president needs to lead** and then the Republicans have a choice,” Medina said. “The best way to share the credit is for them to step up and engage and act together with the president.”

**Indian Relations**

**2NC**

**Immigration reform expands skilled labor—spurs relations and economic growth in China and India.**

**LA Times 11/9/12** [Other countries eagerly await U.S. immigration reform, http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/world\_now/2012/11/us-immigration-reform-eagerly-awaited-by-source-countries.html]

"**Comprehensive immigration reform will see expansion of skilled labor visas," predicted** B. Lindsay **Lowell, director of policy studies for the Institute for the Study of International Migration at Georgetown University**. A former research chief for the congressionally appointed Commission on Immigration Reform, **Lowell said he expects to see at least a fivefold increase in the number of highly skilled labor visas that would provide "a significant shot in the arm for India and China." There is widespread consensus among economists and academics that skilled migration fosters new trade and business relationships between countries and enhances links to the global economy, Lowell said. "Countries like India and China weigh the opportunities of business abroad** from their expats with the possibility of brain drain, **and** I think **they** still **see the immigration opportunity as a bigger plus than not," he said**.

**US-Indian relations avert South Asian nuclear war.**

**Schaffer 2** [Spring 2002, Teresita—Director of the South Asia Program at the Center for Strategic and International Security, Washington Quarterly, Lexis]

Washington's increased interest in India since the late 1990s reflects India's economic expansion and position as Asia's newest rising power. New Delhi, for its part, is adjusting to the end of the Cold War. As a result, both giant democracies see that they can **benefit by closer cooperation**. For Washington, the advantages include a wider network of friends in Asia at a time when the region is changing rapidly, as well as a **stronger position** from which to help **calm possible future nuclear tensions in the region**. Enhanced trade and investment benefit both countries and are a **prerequisite for improved U.S. relations with India**. For India, the country's ambition to assume a stronger leadership role in the world and to maintain an economy that lifts its people out of poverty depends critically on good relations with the United States.

**Relations IL – Visas Key**

**Plan is a symbolic gesture --- key to cooperation**

**Stringer 4** (Dr. Kevin D., Visiting Professor – Thunderbird School of Global Management and Ph.D. in History and International Security – University of Zurich, “The Visa Dimension of Diplomacy”, Discussion Papers in Diplomacy, http://www.clingendael.nl/publications/2004/20040300\_cli\_paper\_dip\_issue91.pdf)

**The consular element of** national **diplomatic power plays an essential, but often underrated** and overlooked **role in international relations**. **This consular dimension of diplomacy has often taken the backseat to the political and military aspects of foreign policy in the past**. **This situation has changed dramatically with the** end of the Cold War and the **rapid globalization of the world economy**. **This shift** to a unipolar world, but global marketplace, **emphasizes the increasing importance of** so-called **'low politics' - trade, commerce, tourism, migration - all traditional consular areas of interest**. While one superpower, the United States, may currently dominate the military and political aspects of the international environment, **the** economic and commercial **interplay among nations** is more diffuse and **requires a nuanced** and multilateral diplomatic **approach**. This environment is caused largely by the increasingly complex interdependencies among the world's economies, which no longer recognize political, commercial, geologic, or technological borders as barriers. The line between domestic and foreign events has been blurred by the impact of external forces ranging from diseases like Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) to technological developments like Chat. Indeed, technology has tended to transcend borders, crossing them and turning them into obstacles to progress.1 In this type of international world, a nuanced and multilateral approach requires the flexible application of a variety of diplomatic instruments, either In solo or in unison with other countries, to influence positively or negatively, the actions of other state actors and non-state actors, to achieve national interest goals. This type of environment places emphasis on all operative aspects of diplomacy, one of which is its consular component. With the use of force between stairs more and more restricted as a policy option in the International system, alternative diplomatic options must be sought. **Nowhere is the** partial fulfillment of this **need for a variety of diplomatic instruments better illustrated than in** the often overlooked, and seemingly mundane area of consular **visa operations**. **The lowly visa serves an important purpose in international relations and is a well-used**, but little studied, **instrument of foreign policy** in today's system of sovereign states.' In fact, its use may be more diplomatically opportune when other, blunter instruments are nor available or possible. This paper will attempt to illustrate the practical uses of 'visa diplomacy" as an integral device in the conduct of international relations. **Visa diplomacy is** defined as the use of visa **issuance** or denial at an individual, group or interstate level, **to influence another state's policies**. The first section will provide a brief overview of consular visa diplomacy. The second section will focus on examples of visa issuance as a symbolic diplomatic measure to express a shift in foreign policy to greater cooperation or recognition. The third section will consider examples of diplomatic retorsion1 with visa usage as an expression of protest, a step in conflict escalation, a measure for diplomatic coercion, or as part of a wider sanctions package targeted towards specific, decision-making groups. Visa regimes as a component of the national security system and border control will not be addressed in this paper'. The conclusion will assess where the use of visa diplomacy seems most effective in international relations. 1. Consular Visa Diplomacy in General The Importance of consular services as an integral part of a country's diplomacy in general is insufficiently understood and appreciated. It is insufficiently understood not only by the general public but also by persons who make the study of foreign policy their specialty - even by many practitioners of diplomacy/ Consular operational services generally divide themselves into two areas: the provision of assistance to citizens abroad and the issuance of visas to qualified foreigners seeking entry Into the represented state. The first area plays an important role in how a country's consular service is perceived in domestic politics. This citizen service will not be addressed in this paper. The second area, **visas**, **influences how a country is perceived abroad and serves as a tool in a country's overall foreign policy**. Broadly speaking, the consular aspects of foreign policy issues have become much more prominent and complex in the 20th and 21st centuries. The **movements of people** - voluntary and forced, individual and mass - **are a growing international phenomenon caused by global trends in technology and demography, income disparities, and political instabilities**.6 The division of the world between developed and developing countries, coupled with advanced telecommunications and internet technology which allows both camps to view each other instantaneously, encourages both legal and illegal migration from one to the other. This trend is abetted by an ease of travel that puts any destination within reach of a long haul flight. In taking the United States example, many people wish to come to the United States, not Just to travel, but for business, study, family visits, and of course immigration.' **This** **interest makes the use of visa** denial or **issuance an influential tool** - but not necessarily a powerful one in comparison to force or trade sanctions - **for foreign policy applications**. The visa component of consular diplomacy can be visualized as the foreign policy bridge between the foreign individual and his government. The application of a **specific visa policy can affect international relations between states at a** personal (individual applicant), group (tourists, businessmen, students, government officials) or **intergovernment level**. Briefly viewing visa diplomacy at these three levels gives an Indication of its influence on international relations. From the first level perspective, consular work should be esteemed in the diplomatic service because it concerns the individual. Consular officers are the first, and sometimes only people who represent their country to foreigners abroad.5 Consular officers may well be the first government representatives aliens abroad will meet. The impression consular officers make on these people may be lasting. The skill, the patience, the civility, the decency they bring to their tasks in dealing with foreigners can do much to enhance the image of a government, institution, society, or people.3 At this level, consular diplomats are exposed to local people, culture, and language directly through visa application interactions."0 A foreign culture and society are intensively learned by interviewing visa applicants. One could argue that the consular visa interview is the most basic level of bilateral diplomatic interaction between two countries. This viewpoint is buttressed by Herbert Butterfield's emphasis on the importance of individual personalities in shaping events, because "every public action which was ever taken can be regarded as a private act. the personal decision of somebody'." Nowhere Is this more true than at the level of the visa interview, where the foreign policy of a government is directly communicated to and affects the individual foreigner. As one foreign service officer noted. 'Consular officers affect lives retail, in concrete terms, one body at a time'. **The issuance** or withholding **of visas** is retail diplomacy at its best. Yet this form of retail diplomacy **can have serious bilateral implications – both political and economic –** in terms of visa issuance or denial **at the** private citizen, governing elite, or **state level**. This position is echoed by US Congressman Peter Rodino, who stated, the exercise of those powers, duties, and functions conferred upon consular officers relating to the granting or refusal of visas **has far reaching effects on the lives of persons seeking admission to the** **U**nited **S**tates: **it affects our foreign policy and foreigners' perception of this nation**: and most importantly, it affects our national security and national interest." **Thousands of visa cases are sensitive in political and foreign policy terms**. The issuance or refusal of a visa to a controversial person invariably embroils a nation in foreign policy issues.14 **Long lines of visa applicants** snaking through the streets, beginning at ridiculously early hours, **can lead to public relations problems in host countries**.15 Restrictions on visas for specific groups like students or athletes can also have implications ranging from demonstrations to host government intervention. In one anecdotal example, when the visa of a noted South African boxer was revoked during the apartheid era. the Foreign Minister of that country telephoned the US Secretary of State to point out that **unless reversed**, that action **could have a deleterious effect** on the ongoing Namibian negotiations.16 **Clearly then, a nation's visa policy towards another state**, and hence its citizens, **has both symbolic diplomatic inferences and practical economic implications**.

**A2: Relations Resilient**

**CIR is the vital internal link to resiliency- collapse possible without deeper ties**

**Davis ’10** (Ted, School of Public Policy @ George Mason University, Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management, 2/18-20, “The Global Dynamic: of High-Skill Migration: The Case of U.S./India Relations”, <https://www.appam.org/conferences/international/maastricht2010/sessions/downloads/389.1.pdf>)

**There is no reason to think that the present system** **of** **governing migration is optimal**. Migration is a dynamic process, while the migration policy-making machinery is slow and cumbersome. The possibility that policy-makers will fail to capitalize on opportunities for mutual gain among sending and receiving countries is especially large for high-skill migration. **At first glance**, the case of **India** — U**.S. relations would** **appear to contradict this point**. As noted, both **India** and the U.S. have **experienced** significant **benefits from migration** and circulation. **Yet many** **Indians** **still live in poverty** **and** many **Americans see India**, its immigrants and offshore services, **as a threat to their** **jobs and wages**. Thus **there is a growing tension** between these countries **that could** impede, if not **derail**, **further** **progress**. **Absent** a program of **cooperation**, and perhaps exacerbated by the economic downturn, there is a risk that **each country would be inclined to act unilaterally** in pursuit of its own interests. However, these typically protectionist or nationalistic actions may impede the flow of immigrants, but it could impede the flow of ideas, reduce knowledge spillovers, and ultimately inhibit innovation and growth.¶ Cooperation on **migration** **offers** **an opportunity** for countries **to address** the **tensions** **that arise** from immigration **while opening avenues for** pursuing **common objectives and mutual prosperity**. Though it may be desirable to consider a common system of migration across countries that transcend bilateral arrangements, such a system may not be able to address the unique dynamics that exist between countries. Nor should these relationships be viewed uniformly. Differences exist between sectors, such as technology services and medical services that call for their own strategies. This paper represents only a beginning point for understanding

**Spillover highly possible- deep relations are a new development- CIR needed to cement ties**

**Lal & Rajagopalan ’05** (Rollie, Assistant Professor at Vlerick Management School in Leuven, Belgium and political scientist for RAND, Rajesh, Associate Professor in International Politics, Center for International Politics, “US-India Strategic Dialogue”, <http://www.rand.org/pubs/conf_proceedings/2005/RAND_CF201.pdf>)

**Relations** **between** the world's two largest democracies, **India and the U**nited **S**tates, **have encountered** many **obstacles** over the years. **Until recently, the** two **countries had limited interactions** **and few cooperative endeavours**. However, the relationship has improved dramatically over the past several years, and today is better than at any previous point in history'. Through dialogue on a number of issues, at various levels of government, academia, and the press, **the current relationship has achieved great depth and maturity**.¶ **This is the kind of interaction** that both **India and the U**nited **S**tates **will need to keep working at** **rather** **than take for granted**. Candid **exchange of ideas is the key to ensuring** that natural **differences** of interests and perspectives **do not lead back to** the **estrangement** that characterized die relationship between the two countries for the last half a century.

**And- there’s a question of depth- even if some relations are inevitable it’s about maximizing cooperation- CIR solves**

Olivia **Enos**, Research Assistant, Asian Studies at The Heritage Foundation 1-18-**2013** <http://blog.heritage.org/2013/01/18/unleash-the-market-u-s-india-economic-relations/>

**The U.S.–India** economic **relationship is** undeniably **expanding**. **The question is how to maximize it**. A recent report published by The Heritage Foundation, “Unleashing the Market in the U.S.–India Economic Relationship, Part I,” begins to answer that very question. The publication sheds light on what could happen if the largest economy (the U.S.) and the fourth-largest economy (India) in the world capitalized on their economic strengths.¶ The report is the first of an ongoing series intended to enhance economic relations between the two nations by focusing on the proper role of government, the positive strides that can be made in the private sector despite poor government policies, and recommended additional actions that the U.S. and India should take to facilitate greater exchange between the two markets.¶ **U.S.–India bilateral trade**, at just $58 billion, **is fairly small**, **especially** when **compared to U.S. trade with South Korea** that comes to around $100 billion. While trade in services is flourishing, trade in goods fails when measured against the natural benefits of comparative advantage. Other **barriers to increased** **trade** levels **include** India’s underdeveloped intellectual property rights system, as well as **immigration restrictions on high-skilled workers wanting to come to the U.S** or go to India.¶ There is hope for the future if foreign direct investment (FDI) in India is realized by working at the state level, relaxing immigration barriers to high-skilled workers wanting to work in both India and the U.S., and passing a Bilateral Investment Treaty (BIT). The private sector also offers great opportunities for growth that require less political change and expedites the process of investment. The combination of these action steps will make for a more open and economically prosperous environment.¶ **Are U.S.–India relations growing? The answer is:** **They could be growing much more**, **if** both **sides would unleash the power of the free market.**

**Relations Good – Afghanistan**

**Strong US-India relations key to Afghani stability – spills over to Pakistan and regional extremism.**

Neena **Shenai**, adjunct scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, November 18, **2009**, “The Critical U.S-India Relationship,” The American, <http://www.american.com/archive/2009/november/the-critical-u-s-india-relationshipg>

Afghanistan. India shares the desire of the United States for a stable, secure Afghanistan. Although India has no military involvement in Afghanistan (due to Pakistani sensitivities), India’s current and future reconstruction activities in Afghanistan are critical to successful U.S. efforts. In fact, **closer U.S. cooperation with** a democratic, U.S.-friendly **India**—a blossoming regional and rising global power—**is vital to stability and the balance of power in the region.** India has already committed more than US$1.3 billion in development assistance for infrastructure and civic projects in Afghanistan. The Indian government also has longstanding ties with Afghanistan pre-dating the Taliban’s rule and enjoys close relations with Afghan President Hamid Karzai, which could assist in rooting out corruption and containing violent Islamic extremism. While Pakistan remains uneasy about India’s intentions in Afghanistan, India has no interest in a destabilized Pakistan and instead seeks to contain Taliban and other terrorist elements and prevent their incursions into Kashmir. By supporting the Karzai government’s efforts to compartmentalize extremist elements in Afghanistan, India’s investment activities in concert with U.S. counterinsurgency efforts could prevent the re-Talibanization of Afghanistan, reversion of Afghanistan into a safe haven for terrorists, and a full-scale spillover of the conflict into Pakistan’s bordering tribal areas and Kashmir. Accordingly, the United States should seek to allay Pakistan’s fears and more publicly support India’s reconstruction efforts in Afghanistan. After all, India sees itself with, in the words of Prime Minister Singh, “vital stakes in the peace, progress, and stability” of the region.

**Spills over to Central Asia and causes great power war.**

Rollie **Lal**, PhD and political Scientist at RAND, **2006**, “Central Asia and its Asian Neighbors”

<http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2006/RAND_MG440.pdf>

The relationship between the Central Asian states and their neighbors is complex and heavily influenced by the situation in Afghanistan. **Afghanistan forms the link between regions, and it has endured a great deal of meddling from** various sides, as in the past few decades, **the United States, Pakistan, India, Iran, Russia, Uzbekistan, and other countries** have attempted to push for a friendly government in Afghanistan. Since September 11, 2001, and the fall of the Taliban, **Afghanistan has also gained in importance as a feasible key transport route for increased trade and security cooperation between the countries of Central Asia and India and Pakistan.**1 **Stability in Afghanistan has had a** profound effect **on Central Asian security as both religious radicalism and drugs emanating from Afghanistan threaten the region**. During the Afghan-Soviet war, the United States in effect, through Pakistan, supported fundamentalist Islamic teachings and military training of Afghan, Pakistani, and other Central Asian militants in an effort to expel the Soviet Union from Afghanistan.2 The growth of Islamic fundamentalism from the Afghan-Soviet war accelerated the spread of a religious ideology throughout the formerly communist countries. The Taliban trained Uzbek, Tajik, and Uighur radicals, spurring the growth of destabilizing fundamentalist movements throughout the region.3 In 1992, leaders of the Islamic Renaissance Party (IRP) fled Tajikistan to take refuge and regroup in Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iran, and Russia.4 During the 1990s, Afghanistan also became a haven for the IMU.5 Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Tajikistan all moved to support the anti-Taliban Northern Alliance in the 1990s in the hopes of defeating the fundamentalist threat.6 The **Central Asian states remain concerned by the continued presence of militants in Afghanistan** and, now, Pakistan, and also by the booming drug trade that passes through Afghanistan and Central Asia into Europe and Russia.7 Narcotics flow from Afghanistan via multiple routes in the region to foreign markets, and populations of these transit corridors are increasingly consumers of the drugs as well. Traffickers transport opiates north through Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan on to Russia, and west through Iran and Turkmenistan to Turkey and Europe.8 Tajikistan has made efforts to stem the flow of drugs across its border from Afghanistan, establishing two antidrug agencies in Afghanistan to coordinate military and nonmilitary operations with international troops and Afghan forces in the border areas.9 Since the fall of the Taliban, many local leaders have retained considerable power and maintain some ability to destabilize the Kabul government. In addition, various renegade militant groups and remnants of the Taliban continue to operate in parts of Afghanistan, particularly near the Pakistani border. The ability of these groups to move nimbly across the border to evade counterterrorism forces and border patrols has been a cause for consternation among Afghan border patrols has been a cause for consternation among Afghanistan’s neighbors. Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Kazakhstan, and Kyrgyzstan are concerned that Afghanistan could revert to a haven for terrorist training, sending the militants back into their countries to de- stabilize regimes.11 **A political vacuum in Afghanistan has traditionally drawn its neighboring countries in to compete for influence.** Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, and Tajikistan have an interest in fostering trade and transport linkages both with and through Afghanistan, but they face difficulties in maintaining security for the routes.12 Iran has been successful in moving forward with an agreement to trade goods with Uzbekistan through Afghanistan. This agreement has facilitated Uzbekistan’s access to needed ports for export.13

**It goes nuclear.**

M. Ehsan **Ahrari**, Prof of National Security @ the Armed Forces Staff College**, 2001**, Jihadi Groups, Nuclear Pakistan and the New Great Game, <http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/ssi/jihadi.pdf>, August 2001

**South and Central Asia constitute a part of the world where a well-designed American strategy might help avoid** crises or **catastrophe**. The U.S. military would provide only one component of such a strategy, and a secondary one at that, but has an important role to play through engagement activities and regional confidence-building. **Insecurity has led the states of the region to seek weapons of mass destruction, missiles, and conventional arms. It has also led them toward policies which undercut the security of their neighbors. If such activities continue, the result could be increased terrorism, humanitarian disasters, continued low-level conflict and potentially even major regional war or a thermonuclear exchange.** A shift away from this pattern could allow the states of the region to become solid economic and political partners for the United States, thus representing a gain for all concerned.

**Relations Good – Asian Stability**

**Relations key to Asian stability and the US economy.**

**Tellis,** Senior Associate at the Carnegie Endowment, 11/16/**2005** (Ashley, Testimony before the House Committee on International Relations, http://www.carnegieendowment.org/publications/index.cfm?fa=view&id=17693&prog=zgp&proj=znpp,zsa,zusr)

If I am permitted to digress a bit, let me say parenthetically, that advancing the growth of Indian power, as the Administration currently intends, is not directed, as many critics have alleged, at “containing” China. I do not believe that a policy of containing China is either feasible or necessary at this point in time. (India too, currently, has no interest in becoming part of any coalition aimed at containing China.) Rather**, the Administration’s strategy of assisting India to become a major world power** in the twenty-first century **is directed**, first and foremost, **towards constructing a stable geopolitical order in Asia that is conducive to peace** and prosperity. There is little doubt today that the Asian continent is poised to become the new center of gravity in international politics. Although lower growth in the labor force, reduced export performance, diminishing returns to capital, changes in demographic structure, and the maturation of the economy all suggest that national growth rates in several key Asian states—in particular Japan, South Korea, and possibly China—are likely to decline in comparison to the latter half of the Cold War period, the spurt in Indian growth rates, coupled with the relatively high though still marginally declining growth rates in China, will propel Asia’s share of the global economy to some 43% by 2025, thus making the continent the largest single locus of economic power worldwide. **An Asia that hosts economic power of such magnitude, along with its strong and growing connectivity to the American economy, will become an arena vital to the United States**— in much the same way that Europe was the grand prize during the Cold War. In such circumstances, **the Administration’s policy of developing a new global partnership with India represents a considered effort at “shaping” the emerging Asian environment to suit American interests** in the twenty-first century. Even as the United States focuses on developing good relations with all the major Asian states, it is eminently reasonable for Washington not only to invest additional resources in strengthening the continent’s democratic powers but also to deepen the bilateral relationship enjoyed with each of these countries—on the assumption that **the proliferation of strong democratic states in Asia represents the best insurance against intra-continental instability as well as threats that may emerge against the United States and its regional presence. Strengthening New Delhi and transforming U.S-Indian ties**, therefore, **has everything to do with American confidence in Indian democracy and the conviction that its growing strength, tempered by its liberal values, brings only benefits for Asian stability and American security**. As Undersecretary of State Nicholas Burns succinctly stated in his testimony before this Committee, “By cooperating with India now, we accelerate the arrival of the benefits that India’s rise brings to the region and the world.”

**Conflicts in East Asia go nuclear**

Jonathan S. **Landay**, National Security and Intelligence Correspondent, **-2K** [“Top Administration Officials Warn Stakes for U.S. Are High in Asian Conflicts”, Knight Ridder/Tribune News Service, March 10, p. Lexis]

Few if any experts think China and Taiwan, North Korea and South Korea, or India and Pakistan are spoiling to fight. But even a minor miscalculation by any of them could destabilize Asia, jolt the global economy and even start a nuclear war. India, Pakistan and China all have nuclear weapons, and North Korea may have a few, too. Asia lacks the kinds of organizations, negotiations and diplomatic relationships that helped keep an uneasy peace for five decades in Cold War Europe. “Nowhere else on Earth are the stakes as high and relationships so fragile,” said Bates Gill, director of northeast Asian policy studies at the Brookings Institution, a Washington think tank. “We see the convergence of great power interest overlaid with lingering confrontations with no institutionalized security mechanism in place. There are elements for potential disaster.” In an effort to cool the region’s tempers, President Clinton, Defense Secretary William S. Cohen and National Security Adviser Samuel R. Berger all will hopscotch Asia’s capitals this month. For America, the stakes could hardly be higher. There are 100,000 U.S. troops in Asia committed to defending Taiwan, Japan and South Korea, and the United States would **instantly** become embroiled if Beijing moved against Taiwan or North Korea attacked South Korea. While Washington has no defense commitments to either India or Pakistan, a conflict between the two could end the global taboo against using nuclear weapons and demolish the already shaky international nonproliferation regime. In addition, globalization has made a stable Asia, with its massive markets, cheap labor, exports and resources, indispensable to the U.S. economy. Numerous U.S. firms and millions of American jobs depend on trade with Asia that totaled $600 billion last year, according to the Commerce Department.

**Relations Good – Democracy**

**US-India relations key to global democracy promotion.**

Mohammed **Ayoob**, Distinguished Professor of International Relations at James Madison College, Michigan State University, Washington Quarterly, Winter **2000**

Furthermore, the recent emphasis in U.S. rhetoric on creation of a "democratic community of states," itself based on a popularized version of the "democratic peace" thesis, can be expected to aid in improving Indian-U.S. relations. The two states crucial to legitimizing the idea of a global democratic community are obviously the world's largest democracy (India) and the world's most powerful democracy (the United States), and **their partnership is essential** for the idea to be taken seriously. n3 If democracy and human rights are to inform U.S. foreign policy making in any substantial fashion in the coming decade, Washington's relations with New Delhi must inevitably move to a higher plane of understanding and cooperation.

**Democracy solves extinction.**

**Diamond**, Senior Fellow at the Hoover Institution, **1995** (Larry, Promoting Democracy in the 1990s, December, http://www.wilsoncenter.org/subsites/ccpdc/pubs/di/fr.htm)

This hardly exhausts the lists of threats to our security and well-being in the coming years and decades. In the former Yugoslavia nationalist aggression tears at the stability of Europe and could easily spread. The flow of illegal drugs intensifies through increasingly powerful international crime syndicates that have made common cause with authoritarian regimes and have utterly corrupted the institutions of tenuous, democratic ones. **Nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons continue to proliferate. The very source of life on Earth, the global ecosystem, appears increasingly endangered**. Most of **these** new and unconventional **threats** to security **are associated with** or aggravated by the weakness or **absence of democracy**, with its provisions for legality, accountability, popular sovereignty, and openness. LESSONS OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY The experience of this century offers important lessons. **Countries that govern themselves in a** truly **democratic fashion do not go to war with one another. They do not aggress against their neighbors** to aggrandize themselves or glorify their leaders. **Democratic governments do not ethnically "cleanse" their own populations, and they are much less likely to face ethnic insurgency. Democracies do not sponsor terrorism against one another. They do not build weapons of mass destruction** to use on or to threaten one another. **Democratic countries form more reliable, open, and enduring trading partnerships. In the long run they offer better and more stable climates for investment. They are more environmentally responsible** because they must answer to their own citizens, who organize to protest the destruction of their environments. **They are better bets to honor international treaties** since they value legal obligations and because their openness makes it much more difficult to breach agreements in secret. Precisely because, within their own borders, they respect competition, civil liberties, property rights, and the rule of law, democracies are the only reliable foundation on which a new world order of international security and prosperity can be built.

**Relations Good – Heg**

**US-India Relations key to heg**

Josy **Joseph**, Deputy Editor at Defence India, “Target Next: Indian Military Bases,” **2003** http://www.rediff.com/news/2003/apr/21josy.htm

The report on the future of Indo-US military relations, being distributed among decision-makers in the United States and made available to a handful of senior members of the Indian government, also speaks of the USAF's desire for 'having access closer to areas of instability'. "American military officers are candid in their plans to eventually seek access to Indian bases and military infrastructure. India's **strategic location** in the centre of Asia, astride the frequently traveled Sea Lanes of Communication (SLOC) linking the Middle East and East Asia, makes India **particularly attractive** to the US military," the report says. The report can be distributed only with the permission of Director, Net Assessment, Office of the Secretary of Defence. The report is the most comprehensive picture of American perspective of its military relation with India and its future aspirations. To some extent it also uncovers Indian military thinking vis-à-vis the US. It has quoted US lieutenant generals as saying that the access to India bases would enable the US military 'to be able to touch the rest of the world' and to **'respond rapidly** to regional crises'. The report, prepared by Juli A MacDonald, an associate at Booz Allen Hamilton, for the department of defence, is based on interviews of 42 key Americans, including 23 active military officers, 15 government officials and four others. In India MacDonald met 10 active Indian military officers and five government officials besides several members of the National Security Council, and outside experts advising the government. For understandable reasons, none of the individuals are identified by name, but by their ranks or other positions. The report points out that many American military planners are thinking about 'different sets of allies and friends for addressing a future strategic environment in Asia that may be dramatically different from today'. "For many, India is the most attractive alternative. For this reasons, several Americans underscored that eventual access to Indian military infrastructure represents a **critical 'strategic hedge'** against dramatic changes in traditional US relationships in Asia," the report says. A South Asia Foreign Area Officer of the US state department has been quoted as saying that India's strategic importance increases if existing US relationships and arrangements in Asia fails. He cites three key possibilities for that: If US relations with other traditional allies (eg Japan, South Korea and Saudi Arabia) becomes more acrimonious or politically uncomfortable for both parties; or if access rights that the United States takes for granted become more restrictive; or if our traditional relationships collapse resulting in a US military withdrawal. The FAO, who is specialises on South Asia and among those few American diplomats who can converse in Hindi, says, "The United States needs to develop alternatives in Asia. India is the optimal choice **if we can overcome** the **obstacles in** building the **relations**hip." An American Colonel says, "The US Navy wants a relatively neutral territory on the opposite side of the world that can provide ports and support for operations in the Middle East. India not only has a good infrastructure, the Indian Navy has proved that it can fix and fuel US ships. Over time, port visits must become a natural event. India is a viable player in supporting **all** naval missions, including escorting and responding to regional crises. In the same vein, the US Air Force would like the Indians to be able to grant them access to bases and landing rights during operations, such as counter-terrorism and heavy airlift support." It is significant that during the 1991 Gulf War-I, India provided refuelling facility to US warplanes. And during Operation Enduring Freedom, several US warships used Indian facilities for rest and recuperation. As part of Operation Enduring Freedom, Indian naval ships provided escorts to merchant vessels from North Arabian Sea till Strait of Malacca in the most active cooperation with US navy in history. In fact, it is in naval cooperation that America sees the immediate future of Indo-US military relations. It is not just access to bases and ports that the US military hopes to get in India, but also training facilities in India. A common theme among high-ranking American officers is that the US military would benefit from training with Indians, particularly if the training could occur on Indian territory. "India has a variety of landscapes, from ice-clad mountains to deserts, and it would help the Americans because military training ranges shrinking and becoming increasingly controversial in the United States," the report says. And for the US navy training with Indian navy is the best way to become 'proficient in the Indian Ocean region', the report adds. The American decision-makers 'believe that the military relationship should result in shared technology and capabilities, and ultimately they would like to be able to respond jointly to regional crises'.

**US leadership prevents multiple scenarios for nuclear conflict – prefer it to all other alternatives**

**Kagan 07** Senior Associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace [Robert “End of Dreams, Return of History” Policy Review (http://www.hoover.org/publications/policyreview/8552512.html#n10)]

Finally, there is the United States itself. As a matter of national policy stretching back across numerous administrations, Democratic and Republican, liberal and conservative, **Americans have insisted on preserving regional predominance in East Asia; the Middle East; the Western Hemisphere**; until recently, **Europe; and** now, increasingly, **Central Asia.** This was its goal after the Second World War, and since the end of the Cold War, beginning with the first Bush administration and continuing through the Clinton years, the United States did not retract but expanded its influence eastward across Europe and into the Middle East, Central Asia, and the Caucasus. **Even as it maintains its position as the predominant global power, it is** also **engaged in hegemonic competitions in these regions with China in East and Central Asia**, with **Iran in the Middle East and Central Asia, and with Russia in Eastern Europe, Central Asia, and the Caucasus.** The United States, too, is more of a traditional than a postmodern power, and though Americans are loath to acknowledge it, they generally prefer their global place as “No. 1” and are equally loath to relinquish it. Once having entered a region, whether for practical or idealistic reasons, they are remarkably slow to withdraw from it until they believe they have substantially transformed it in their own image. They profess indifference to the world and claim they just want to be left alone even as they seek daily to shape the behavior of billions of people around the globe. **The jostling for status and influence among these ambitious nations and would-be nations is a** second **defining feature of the new post-Cold War international system. Nationalism in all its forms is back**, if it ever went away, **and so is international competition for power, influence, honor, and status. American predominance prevents these rivalries from intensifying** — its **regional as well as its global predominance. Were the United States to diminish its influence in the regions where it is currently the strongest power**, the **other nations would settle disputes as great and lesser powers have done in the past:** sometimes through diplomacy and accommodation but often **through confrontation and wars of varying scope, intensity, and destructiveness.** One novel aspect of such a multipolar world is that **most of these powers would possess nuclear weapons. That could make wars between them less likely, or it could simply make them more catastrophic. It is easy but also dangerous to underestimate the role the United States plays in providing a measure of stability in the world even as it also disrupts stability.** For instance, **the United States is the dominant naval power everywhere, such that other nations cannot compete with it even in their home waters. They either happily or grudgingly allow the United States Navy to be the guarantor of international waterways and trade routes, of international access to markets and raw materials such as oil. Even when the United States engages in a war, it is able to play its role as guardian of the waterways. In a more genuinely multipolar world, however, it would not. Nations would compete for naval dominance at least in their own regions and possibly beyond. Conflict between nations would involve struggles on the oceans as well as on land. Armed embargos**, of the kind used in World War i and other major conflicts, **would disrupt trade flows in a way that is now impossible.** Such order as exists in the world rests not only on the goodwill of peoples but also on American power. Such order as exists in the world rests not merely on the goodwill of peoples but on a foundation provided by American power. Even the European Union, that great geopolitical miracle, owes its founding to American power, for without it the European nations after World War ii would never have felt secure enough to reintegrate Germany. Most Europeans recoil at the thought, but **even today Europe’s stability depends on the guarantee**, however distant and one hopes unnecessary, **that the United States could step in to check any dangerous development on the continent. In a genuinely multipolar world, that would not be possible without renewing the danger of world war. People who believe greater equality among nations would be preferable to the present American predominance** often succumb to a basic logical fallacy. They **believe the order the world enjoys today exists independently of American power. They imagine that in a world where American power was diminished, the aspects of international order that they like would remain in place. But that’s not the way it works. International order does not rest on ideas and institutions. It is shaped by configurations of power.** The international order we know today reflects the distribution of power in the world since World War ii, and especially since the end of the Cold War. **A different configuration of power, a multipolar world in which the poles were Russia, China, the United States, India, and Europe, would produce its own kind of order, with different rules and norms reflecting the interests of the powerful states that would have a hand in shaping it.** Would that international order be an improvement? Perhaps for Beijing and Moscow it would. But it is doubtful that it would suit the tastes of enlightenment liberals in the United States and Europe. The current order, of course, is not only far from perfect but also offers no guarantee against major conflict among the world’s great powers. **Even under the umbrella of unipolarity, regional conflicts involving the large powers may erupt.** War could erupt between China and Taiwan and draw in both the United States and Japan. War could erupt between Russia and Georgia, forcing the United States and its European allies to decide whether to intervene or suffer the consequences of a Russian victory. Conflict between India and Pakistan remains possible, as does conflict between Iran and Israel or other Middle Eastern states. These, too, could draw in other great powers, including the United States. **Such conflicts may be unavoidable no matter what policies the United States pursues. But they are more likely to erupt if the United States weakens or withdraws from its positions of regional dominance. This is especially true in East Asia, where most nations agree that a reliable American power has a stabilizing and pacific effect on the region.** That is certainly the view of most of China’s neighbors. But **even China**, which seeks gradually to supplant the United States as the dominant power in the region, **faces the dilemma that an American withdrawal could unleash an ambitious, independent, nationalist Japan. In Europe, too, the departure of the United States from the scene** — even if it remained the world’s most powerful nation — **could be destabilizing. It could tempt Russia to an even more overbearing and potentially forceful approach to unruly nations on its periphery.** Although some realist theorists seem to imagine that the disappearance of the Soviet Union put an end to the possibility of confrontation between Russia and the West, and therefore to the need for a permanent American role in Europe, **history suggests that conflicts in Europe involving Russia are possible even without Soviet communism. If the United States withdrew from Europe** — **if it adopted** what some call a strategy of **“offshore balancing”** — **this could in time increase the likelihood of conflict involving Russia and its near neighbors, which could in turn draw the United States back in under unfavorable circumstances. It is also optimistic to imagine that a retrenchment of the American position in the Middle East and the assumption of a more passive, “offshore” role would lead to greater stability there. The vital interest the United States has in access to oil and the role it plays in keeping access open to other nations in Europe and Asia make it unlikely that American leaders could or would stand back and hope for the best while the powers in the region battle it out.** Nor would a more “even-handed” policy toward Israel, which some see as the magic key to unlocking peace, stability, and comity in the Middle East, obviate the need to come to Israel ’s aid if its security became threatened. That commitment, paired with the American commitment to protect strategic oil supplies for most of the world, practically ensures a heavy American military presence in the region, both on the seas and on the ground. **The subtraction of American power from any region would not end conflict but would simply change the equation. In the Middle East, competition for influence among powers both inside and outside the region has raged for at least two centuries. The rise of Islamic fundamentalism doesn’t change this. It only adds a new and more threatening dimension to the competition**, which neither a sudden end to the conflict between Israel and the Palestinians nor an immediate American withdrawal from Iraq would change. **The alternative to American predominance in the region is not balance and peace. It is further competition. The region and the states within it remain relatively weak. A diminution of American influence would not be followed by a diminution of other external influences. One could expect deeper involvement by both China and Russia, if only to secure their interests. 18 And one could also expect the more powerful states of the region, particularly Iran, to expand and fill the vacuum. It is doubtful that any American administration would voluntarily take actions that could shift the balance of power in the Middle East further toward Russia, China, or Iran. The world hasn’t changed that much.** An American withdrawal from Iraq will not return things to “normal” or to a new kind of stability in the region. It will produce a new instability, one likely to draw the United States back in again. **The alternative to American regional predominance in the Middle East and elsewhere is not a new regional stability. In an era of burgeoning nationalism, the future is likely to be one of intensified competition among nations and nationalist movements. Difficult as it may be to extend American predominance into the future, no one should imagine that a reduction of American power or a retraction of American influence and global involvement will provide an easier path.**

**Relations Good – Sea Lanes/Economy**

**Strong relations key to protect sea lanes in the Indian ocean.**

**Andersen,** ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR OF THE SOUTH ASIA STUDIES PROGRAM PROFESSORIAL LECTURER, SCHOOL OF ADVANCED INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, JOHN HOPKINS UNIVERSITY, **2008** (Walter, Federal News Service, June 25, Lexis)

**A** second **area where there is a good chance of cooperation** with India **is Indian engagement with the U.S. on safeguarding shipping over the critical Indian Ocean sea lanes used to transport a growing percentage of the oil and gas to meet** the **growing demand** from energy- deficient countries like India, China, Japan and Korea. This might be in the form of a memorandum of understanding, preferably multilateral and involving the major users to address our mutual interest in countering terrorism and piracy, providing for search and rescue and humanitarian assistance. Unfortunately, **sea lane protection in the Indian Ocean is presently covered by a number of ad hoc arrangements. Something more institutional is required** (in ?) **Indi**a with vital economic and security interests in these sea lanes **would be a major candidate to be a major participation in the multilateral agreement. It possesses the only indigenous blue-water navy in the Indian Ocean, has troops trained in counterterrorism, and** moreover, **the Indian navy already has a record of collaboration with the U.S.** on counterterrorism by providing escorts to American shipping in 2002 at the Malacca Straits and in 2005 working with the U.S., Japan and Australia on tsunami humanitarian relief activities. **The navies of the U.S. and India**, in addition, **have a record of joint exercising** starting several years ago that are geared to anti- piracy and counterterrorism. **Such cooperation has the advantage of developing a certain comfort level in India for cooperation** -- security cooperation with the United States and provides a model that could be used for security collaboration on a larger scale to face crises affecting the interests of both the United States and India.

**Those sea lanes are key to the global economy.**

**LA Times 08** (August 31, Lexis)

But **just over the horizon runs one of the world's great trade arteries, the shipping lanes where thousands of vessels carry oil** from the Middle East and raw materials to Asia, **returning with television sets**, toys and sneakers **for** European **consumers**. **These tankers provide 80% of China's oil and 65% of India's -- fuel desperately needed for the two countries' rapidly growing economies**. **Japan is almost totally dependent on energy supplies shipped through the Indian Ocean.** Any disruption -- from terrorism, piracy, natural disaster or war -- **could have devastating effects on these countries and, in an increasingly interdependent world,** send ripples across the globe. When an unidentified ship attacked a Japanese oil tanker traveling through the Indian Ocean from South Korea to Saudi Arabia in April, the news sent oil prices to record highs.

**That causes extinction**

**Bearden,** Director, Association of Distinguished American Scientists, **2000** (TE, “The Unnecessary Energy Crisis: How to Solve it Quickly,” June 24, http://www.seaspower.com/EnergyCrisis-Bearden.htm)

History bears out that desperate nations take desperate actions. **Prior to the final economic collapse, the stress on nations will have increased the intensity and number of** their **conflicts, to the point where** the arsenals of weapons of mass destruction (**WMD**) now possessed by some 25 nations, **are almost certain to be released**.  As an example, suppose a starving North Korea {[[7]](http://www.aero2012.com/EnergyCrisis-Bearden.htm#_edn7)} launches nuclear weapons upon Japan and South Korea, including U.S. forces there, in a spasmodic suicidal response. Or suppose a desperate China — whose long-range nuclear missiles (some) can reach the United States — attacks Taiwan. In addition to immediate responses, the **mutual treaties** involved in such scenarios **will quickly draw other nations into the conflict, escalating it significantly.** Strategic nuclear studies have shown for decades that, under such extreme stress conditions, **once a few nukes are launched, adversaries and potential adversaries are then compelled to launch on perception of preparations** by one's adversary.  The real legacy of the MAD concept is this side of the MAD coin that is almost never discussed. Without effective defense, the only chance a nation has to survive at all is to launch immediate full-bore pre-emptive strikes and try to take out its perceived foes as rapidly and massively as possible. As the studies showed, **rapid escalation to full WMD exchange occurs**. Today, a great percent of the WMD arsenals that will be unleashed, are already on site within the United States itself {[[8]](http://www.aero2012.com/EnergyCrisis-Bearden.htm#_edn8)}. **The resulting great Armageddon will destroy civilization** as we know it, **and** perhaps most of **the biosphere**, at least for many decades.

**Relations Good – Terrorism**

**Us-india relations key to solve terrorism**

Mohammed **Ayoob**, Distinguished Professor of International Relations at James Madison College, Michigan State University, Washington Quarterly, Winter **2000**

India and the United States have a major shared interest in foiling the designs of this terrorist network, and it is becoming increasingly clear to both that they must cooperate with each other toward this end. This cooperation has started in earnest, indicated by the fact that for the first time, high-level discussions have taken place between Indian and U.S. officials specifically focused on Afghanistan and the terrorist threat emanating from there. Held in Washington in early September 1999, this meeting is seen as the harbinger of a more coordinated strategy on the issue of counterterrorism. Such coordination has taken on greater urgency because of the recent coup in Pakistan that has brought to power a military establishment suspected of close links with the Taliban.

**Terrorism causes extinction.**

**Sid-Ahmed, 2004** (Mohamed, Managing Editor for Al-Ahali, “Extinction!” August 26-September 1, Issue no. 705, <http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2004/705/op5.htm>)

A nuclear attack by terrorists will be much more critical than Hiroshima and Nagazaki, even if -- and this is far from certain -- the weapons used are less harmful than those used then, Japan, at the time, with no knowledge of nuclear technology, had no choice but to capitulate. Today, the technology is a secret for nobody. So far, except for the two bombs dropped on Japan, nuclear weapons have been used only to threaten. Now we are at a stage where they can be detonated. This completely changes the rules of the game. We have reached a point where anticipatory measures can determine the course of events. Allegations of a terrorist connection can be used to justify anticipatory measures, including the invasion of a sovereign state like Iraq. As it turned out, these allegations, as well as the allegation that Saddam was harbouring WMD, proved to be unfounded. What would be the consequences of a nuclear attack by terrorists? Even if it fails, it would further exacerbate the negative features of the new and frightening world in which we are now living. Societies would close in on themselves, police measures would be stepped up at the expense of human rights, tensions between civilisations and religions would rise and ethnic conflicts would proliferate. It would also speed up the arms race and develop the awareness that a different type of world order is imperative if humankind is to survive. But the still more critical scenario is if the attack succeeds. This could lead to a third world war, from which no one will emerge victorious. Unlike a conventional war which ends when one side triumphs over another, this war will be without winners and losers. When nuclear pollution infects the whole planet, we will all be losers.

**Relations Good – US/China War**

**Relations prevent US-China war over Taiwan.**

Victor **Gobarev**, former scholar at Woodrow Wilson Center and George Washington University, Cato Policy Analysis No. 381, September 11, **2000** (<http://www.cato.org/pubs/pas/pa381.pdf>)

What would such a policy win for the United States? America would get a strategic partner of the highest caliber. Most important, such a policy would dramatically shift the global, geopolitical, and geostrategic balance in favor of the United States. **The geopolitical balance in Asia would be especially tilted in America’s favor. India could help the** **U**nited **S**tates **contain expansionist threats from China to maintain order and stability in East and Southeast Asia**. In addition, **America would move further from the brink of nuclear confrontation with China over the Taiwan issue and other potential sources of friction. China would be less able to contemplate a confrontation with either its neighbors** in East Asia **or with the** **U**nited States **if Beijing had to worry about India’s response. Benefits to U.S. national security interests would occur on a global scale if the** **U**nited **S**tates **and India became** strategic **partners**. Most notably, there would be no chance for an anti-U.S. Russia-India-China alliance. Preventing that outcome alone would be a huge geopolitical success for the United States. Further, effectiveness of U.S. intelligence and special operations against major international terrorist groups located in Afghanistan and Pakistan would significantly increase thanks to direct U.S.-Indian cooperation.

**That causes extinction.**

**Straits Times -2K** (Straits Times, June, 25, 2000, No one gains in war over Taiwan] (PDNSS2115)

THE DOOMSDAY SCENARIO -THE high-intensity scenario postulates a cross-strait war escalating into a full-scale war between the US and China. If Washington were to conclude that splitting China would better serve its national interests, then a full-scale war becomes unavoidable. **Conflict on such a scale would embroil other countries far and near and** -horror of horrors -**raise the possibilityof a nuclear war**. Beijing has already told the US and Japan privately that it considers any country providing bases and logistics support to any US forces attacking China as belligerent parties open to its retaliation. In the region, this means South Korea, Japan, the Philippines and, to a lesser extent, Singapore. **If China were to retaliate, east Asia will be set on fire.** And the conflagration may not end there as **opportunistic powers elsewhere may try to overturn the existing world order**. With the US distracted, **Russia may seek to redefine Europe's political landscape. The balance of power in the Middle East may be similarly upset** by the likes of Iraq. In south Asia, **hostilities between India and Pakistan, each armed with its own nuclear arsenal, could enter a new and dangerous phase:** Will a full-scale Sino-US war lead to a nuclear war? According to General Matthew Ridgeway, commander of the US Eighth Army which fought against the Chinese in the Korean War, the US had at the time thought of using nuclear weapons against China to save the US from military defeat. In his book The Korean War, a personal account of the military and political aspects of the conflict and its implications on future US foreign policy, Gen Ridgeway said that US was confronted with two choices in Korea -truce or a broadened war, which could have led to the use of nuclear weapons. If the US had to resort to nuclear weaponry to defeat China long before the latter acquired a similar capability, there is little hope of winning a war against China 50 years later, short of using nuclear weapons. **The US estimates that China possesses about 20 nuclear warheads that can destroy major American cities. Beijing also seems prepared to go for the nuclear option**. A Chinese military officer disclosed recently that Beijing was considering a review of its "non first use" principle regarding nuclear weapons. Major-General Pan Zhangqiang, president of the military-funded Institute for Strategic Studies, told a gathering at the Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars in Washington that although the government still abided by that principle, there were strong pressures from the military to drop it. He said military leaders considered the use of nuclear weapons mandatory if the country risked dismemberment as a result of foreign intervention. Gen Ridgeway said that **should that come to pass, we would see the destruction of civilization**. There would be no victors in such a war. While the prospect of a nuclear Annaggedon over Taiwan might seem inconceivable, it cannot be ruled out entirely, for China puts sovereignty above everything else.

**Legalization**

**2NC Ag**

**Guest worker is critical to sustain U.S. agriculture**

**AFBF ‘06**

(Texas Agriculture, 2-17, http://www.txfb.org/TexasAgriculture/2006/021706/021706guestworker.htm)

Failure to include comprehensive guest-worker provisions in any new or reformed immigration law could cause up to $9 billion annually in overall losses to the U.S. agriculture industry and losses of up to $5 billion annually in net farm income, according to a detailed study released by the American Farm Bureau Federation. If Congress ultimately approves a new immigration law that does not account for agriculture's needs for guest workers, like the bill approved by the House last year, then the consequences for American agriculture will be **dire**, according to the study. The fruit and vegetable sector as it now exists would disappear, the study says. Up to one-third of producers—who are especially dependent on hired labor—would no longer be able to compete. Instead of stocking produce grown and harvested in the U.S., America's grocers would increasingly fill their shelves with foreign-grown produce, resulting in billions of dollars currently kept in the U.S. being sent overseas. "The agriculture industry is unique in that we are highly dependent on temporary foreign workers to fill jobs that most Americans do not want to perform," said AFBF President Bob Stallman. "Many family farms depend on temporary labor and could not sustain the impact of net farm income losses brought about by current immigration proposals."

**Strong agricultural sector is critical to the overall U.S. economy**

**Journal of Commerce ‘98**

(12-31, Lexis)

U.S. agriculture prices have reached lows not seen in 10, 20 or even 30 years, while the costs of living, labor and machinery are at record highs. The only thing missing that was present 70 years ago is a stock-market plunge and massive unemployment. If this country continues to allow its agriculture to sink to Depression-era levels, how can it keep the stock market from tumbling, too? Think about the stock market's falling to levels of 30 years ago, say around 700, instead of flirting with 9,000. Impossible? In just over two years, cash grain prices have dropped over 70 percent from the high posted in July 1996. Hog prices also reflect a near-70 percent decline since 1990. Many things have contributed to this dramatic decline of commodity prices. Some have directly benefited the consumer, like lower petroleum prices that were passed on at the gas pump. However, this has not been the case with meats and other commodities in 1997 and 1998. Processors and retailers decided they could increase their margins rather than passing on the savings to the consumer (which would have cleaned up the oversupply). Supplies continue to build, benefiting only processors and retailers, not consumers. Free markets have been stymied. I am not trying to tell you we are heading for a sequel of the Great Depression. But why is the greatest production machine in the world, American agriculture, going through such difficult times? Why should a minority, those who produce the majority of our food, be subjected to cost inflation and price deflation at the same time? U. S. taxpayers coughed up $6 billion dollars this year to help the farmer. Along with next year's Freedom to Farm payments, the extra cash is helping us through the crisis. Thank you, it is just what we needed: another Band-Aid. Government policy for the past 60 years has been to intravenously feed farmers the ""antibiotic'' of farm subsidies and price supports. But the wound has never healed. The Freedom to Farm Act attempts to wean agriculture from subsidies and supports by initiating a ""withdrawal'' process. The problem is, other grain-producing countries around the world don't see it that way. They continue to subsidize their producers. The livestock producer gets no help from taxpayers. But if these prices continue, it is a pretty sure bet the banks holding his notes will get bailed out. We can make our products much more affordable to foreign buyers by devaluing the dollar. But, you say, that will cause inflation. Maybe investors should rethink inflation. Maybe a little inflation is much better than another Depression. If you look at government money-supply figures, it would appear that Washington may have started to print money (which, in hindsight, could have prevented the Great Depression). I hope this is the case. The enormous power of the hedge funds that continuously short commodity futures - the pricing mechanism of the world these days - is staggering. If agriculture dies an economic death, the rest of the economy is **sure to follow.**

**Removing guest workers guts U.S. agricultural productivity**

**Rural Migration News ‘96**

(April, <http://migration.ucdavis.edu/rmn/more.php?id=111_0_3_0>)

The three major grower arguments were: 1. That illegal aliens comprise a significant share of the current farm labor force. Growers testified that illegal aliens are 50 to 70 percent of some harvest crews, and they implied that this percentage is typical of the entire hired farm work force despite the legalization of over one million unauthorized workers in the SAW program in 1987-88. (The US Department of Labor estimates that 25 percent of the labor force on US crop farms was unauthorized in 1993-94.) 2. That new control measures under consideration in Congress--more border controls, more interior enforcement, and a more secure work authorization document-- would prevent them from continuing to hire unauthorized workers who present fraudulent documents. Effective controls on hiring illegal aliens would leave them with a labor shortage, they asserted. 3. That the current H-2A program is too inflexible to provide them with foreign workers if labor shortages appear--the US workers recruited for employers allegedly do not show up, work hard, or remain with the employer; growers must pay US and H-2A workers the higher of three wages--prevailing, minimum, or adverse effect wage rate--and provide housing at no charge to the US and temporary foreign workers. In the words of one grower, the H-2A program is "too  structured for a labor market that is relatively unstructured."

**Food insecurity causes conflict**

Marc J. **Cohen**, Special Assistant to the Director General at the International Food Policy Research Institute, **2001** (February, “2020 Vision: The Prospects for Universal Food Security in the Next Two Decades,” [www.ifpri.com](http://www.ifpri.com))

<Conflict, Refugees, and Food Security. Since the end of the Cold War, internal conflicts have proliferated in developing and transition countries, particularly in Africa. Fourteen million refugees have fled these struggles, which have displaced another 20–30 million people within their own countries. Uprooted people are vulnerable to malnutrition and disease, and need humanitarian assistance to survive. Postconflict reconstruction takes years. Not only does violent conflict cause hunger, but hunger often **contributes to conflict**, especially when **resources are scarce** and perceptions of economic injustice are widespread.[[1]](#footnote-1)[25]>

**2NC Bioterrorism**

**Immigration reform prevents inevitable bioterrorism**

**Francis ’01** (Sam, Syndicated Columnist, Immigration Reform: No, 11-15, [http://www.vdare.com/francis/bush\_ amnesty\_si.htm](http://www.vdare.com/francis/bush_%20amnesty_si.htm))

It's been like pulling teeth, but the reality of the alien terrorist threat within the **U**nited **S**tates is finally forcing even the pro-immigration Bush administration to recognize the suicidal folly of tolerating mass immigration from countries and cultures profoundly different from our own. Last week the president himself uttered the first words that indicate he's starting to perceive where the real danger comes from. [[Read transcript](http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/10/20011029-15.html) , listen via [RealAudio.](http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/10/20011029-15.a.ram)] Acknowledging that "never did we realize that people would take advantage of our generosity to the extent that they have," Mr. Bush ticked off a [list of changes](http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/10/20011029-13.html) in how the country would receive—or not receive—immigrants in the future. Tighter visa security and procedures, the most popular mantra of the hour, were high on the list, but so were new regulations forbidding the entry of suspected and potential terrorists. Later in the week, Attorney General [John Ashcroft](http://www.usdoj.gov/ag/speeches/2001/agcrisisremarks10_31.htm) unveiled a new list of 46 more groups for the list of known terrorist organizations. This is progress, sort of. Apparently it requires immense concentration of mind and steely girding of loins for the ruling class to see that letting just about anyone who wants to come here enter the country and wander about at will is really **not a** good idea in itself, let alone the most effective way to deter foreign terrorists. Even with the new announcements, the president had to pause every other sentence to explain that he's really not against immigration per se. Although we need to "tighten up the visas," Mr. Bush also insisted "that's not to say we're not going to let people come into our country; of course we are." Then again, just because some people we let into our country are evil and need to be "brought to justice," "by far the vast majority of people who have come to America are really good, decent people—people that we're proud to have here." Maybe so, but it ought to be unnecessary for the president to have to keep saying it. No doubt most of the people of Afghanistan are "really good, decent people" as well, but neither the president nor the military leaders planning the bombing campaign feel the necessity to tell us so. As for the late and unlamented "amnesty for illegal Mexican immigrants," that dominated the news [prior to Sept. 11](http://www.vdare.com/francis/contra_gigot.htm), it turns out that amnesty is not quite as late as some had thought. "It's [not dead](http://www.vdare.com/francis/amnesty_its_alive.htm)," says White House press secretary [Ari Fleischer](http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/10/20011029-8.html#Immigration-law), but due to "other duties," drawing up the amnesty plan just "has not moved at the pace the president had hoped it would move." What all of this means is that the ruling class in general and the Bush administration in particular have not really changed their minds about immigration one iota. It's just that they have at least enough political sense to grasp that most Americans know immigration is a major reason why we have foreign terrorism at all, why we are having to worry about continuing [anthrax attacks](http://www.vdare.com/francis/anthrax.htm), why we need to keep worrying about what immigrant terrorists are planning to do to us in the future, and why the FBI and similar agencies keep issuing warnings about imminent terrorist attacks. If there were no Arabic or Muslim immigrants here, if those here who are clearly sympathetic to terrorism or are clearly anti-American in their religious and political views were kicked out, there would not be much of a terrorist threat at all.

**Bioterror causes extinction**

**Steinbrenner ’97** (John, Snr Fellow – Brookings, Foreign Policy, 12-22, Lexis)

Although human pathogens are often lumped with nuclear explosives and lethal chemicals as potential weapons of mass destruction, there is an obvious, fundamentally important difference: Pathogens are alive, weapons are not. Nuclear and chemical weapons do not reproduce themselves and do not independently engage in adaptive behavior; pathogens do both of these things. That deceptively simple observation has immense implications. The use of a manufactured weapon is a singular event. Most of the damage occurs immediately. The aftereffects, whatever they may be, decay rapidly over time and distance in a reasonably predictable manner. Even before a nuclear warhead is detonated, for instance, it is possible to estimate the extent of the subsequent damage and the likely level of radioactive fallout. Such predictability is an essential component for tactical military planning. The use of a pathogen, by contrast, is an extended process whose scope and timing cannot be precisely controlled. For most potential biological agents, the predominant drawback is that they would not act swiftly or decisively enough to be an effective weapon. But for a few pathogens - ones most likely to have a decisive effect and therefore the ones most likely to be contemplated for deliberately hostile use - the risk runs in the other direction. A lethal pathogen that could efficiently spread from one victim to another would be capable of initiating an intensifying cascade of disease that might **ultimately threaten the entire world population**. The 1918 influenza epidemic demonstrated the potential for a global contagion of this sort but not necessarily its outer limit.

**2NC Terrorism**

**Immigration reform is critical to prevent terrorism**

-Ends underground labor markets

-Reduces demand for fake documents

-Frees up human and financial resources

**Griswold ’02** (David T., associate director of the Cato Institute's Center for Trade Policy Studies, "Fixing the Problem of Illegal Mexican," http://www.freetrade.org/pubs/pas/tpa-019.pdf )

Members of Congress rightly understood, when crafting the legislation, that Mexican migration is not a threat to national security. Indeed, legalizing and regularizing the movement of workers across the U.S.-Mexican border could enhance our national security by bringing much of the underground labor market into the open, encouraging newly documented workers to cooperate fully with law enforcement officials, and freeing resources for border security and the war on terrorism. Legalization of Mexican migration would drain a large part of the underground swamp that facilitates illegal immigration. It would reduce the demand for fraudulent documents, which in turn would reduce the supply available for terrorists trying to operate surreptitiously inside the United States. It would encourage millions of currently undocumented workers to make themselves known to authorities by registering with the government, reducing cover for terrorists who manage to enter the country and overstay their visas. Legalization would allow the government to devote more of its resources to keeping terrorists out of the country. Before September 11, the U.S. government had stationed more than four times as many border enforcement agents on the Mexican border as along the Canadian border, even though the Canadian border is more than twice as long and has been the preferred border of entry for Middle Easterners trying to enter the United States illegally.74 A system that allows Mexican workers to enter the United States legally would free up thousands of government personnel and save an estimated $3 billion a year75—resources that would then be available to fight terrorism. The ongoing effort to stop Mexican migration only diverts **attention** and **resources** from the war on terrorism. Yet some anti-immigration groups continue to demand that even more effort be devoted to stopping Mexican migration. According to Steven Camarota of the Center for Immigration Studies, “A real effort to control the border with Mexico would require perhaps 20,000 agents and the development of a system of formidable fences and other barriers along those parts of the border used for illegal crossings.”76 Such a policy would be a waste of resources and personnel and would do nothing to make America more secure against terrorists.

**Extinction**

**Alexander ’03** (Yonah, Prof, Dir – Inter-University for Terrorism Studies, Washington Times, 8-28, Lexis)

Unlike their historical counterparts, contemporary terrorists have introduced a new scale of violence in terms of conventional and unconventional threats and impact. The internationalization and brutalization of current and future terrorism make it clear we have entered an Age of Super Terrorism [e.g. biological, chemical, radiological, nuclear and cyber] with its serious implications concerning national, regional and global security concerns. Two myths in particular must be debunked immediately if an effective counterterrorism "best practices" strategy can be developed [e.g., strengthening international cooperation]. The first illusion is that terrorism can be greatly reduced, if not eliminated completely, provided the root causes of conflicts - political, social and economic - are addressed. The conventional illusion is that terrorism must be justified by oppressed people seeking to achieve their goals and consequently the argument advanced by "freedom fighters" anywhere, "give me liberty and I will give you death," should be tolerated if not glorified. This traditional rationalization of "sacred" violence often conceals that the real purpose of terrorist groups is to gain political power through the barrel of the gun, in violation of fundamental human rights of the noncombatant segment of societies. For instance, Palestinians religious movements [e.g., Hamas, Islamic Jihad] and secular entities [such as Fatah's Tanzim and Aqsa Martyr Brigades]] wish not only to resolve national grievances [such as Jewish settlements, right of return, Jerusalem] but primarily to destroy the Jewish state. Similarly, Osama bin Laden's international network not only opposes the presence of American military in the Arabian Peninsula and Iraq, but its stated objective is to "unite all Muslims and establish a government that follows the rule of the Caliphs." The second myth is that strong action against terrorist infrastructure [leaders, recruitment, funding, propaganda, training, weapons, operational command and control] will only increase terrorism. The argument here is that law-enforcement efforts and military retaliation inevitably will fuel more brutal acts of violent revenge. Clearly, if this perception continues to prevail, particularly in democratic societies, there is the danger it will paralyze governments and thereby encourage further terrorist attacks. In sum, past experience provides useful lessons for a realistic future strategy. The prudent application of force has been demonstrated to be an effective tool for short- and long-term deterrence of terrorism. For example, Israel's targeted killing of Mohammed Sider, the Hebron commander of the Islamic Jihad, defused a "ticking bomb." The assassination of Ismail Abu Shanab - a top Hamas leader in the Gaza Strip who was directly responsible for several suicide bombings including the latest bus attack in Jerusalem - disrupted potential terrorist operations. Similarly, the U.S. military operation in Iraq eliminated Saddam Hussein's regime as a state sponsor of terror. Thus, it behooves those countries victimized by terrorism to understand a cardinal message communicated by Winston Churchill to the House of Commons on May 13, 1940: "Victory at all costs, victory in spite of terror, victory however long and hard the road may be: For without victory, there is no survival."

**Terror IL – Legalization Key**

**That’s key to solve terrorism**

**NYT ‘02**

(9-13, Lexis)

President Vicente Fox of Mexico says that it is time for the United States to move ahead on foreign policy matters derailed by the Sept. 11 attacks, specifically, America's relations with his country. "By dedicating so much concentration to the issue of security, bilateral matters pass to a secondary level," Mr. Fox said in an interview, conducted in Spanish, on Tuesday. He urged President Bush not to forsake his promise to work with Mexico on issues including broad immigration reforms. "Those matters continue to have enormous importance to us," he said. "I ask myself if it is necessary to choose between the two issues?" "I believe that work can be done on security, in combating terrorism," he said. "But at the same time, the world must continue working. The world must continue advancing, and even more our bilateral relations with the United States." Mexico responded to the attacks by taking up Mr. Bush's call to make security, especially at Mexico's northern and southern borders, a foreign policy priority. Mr. Fox declared that Mexico, which had won a seat on the United Nations Security Council, was a firm ally in the fight against terrorism.

**2NC US-Mexico Relations**

**Guest worker is critical to US-Mexican relations**

**Houston Chronicle ‘04**

(11-22, Lexis)

The 21-nation summit focused on issues such as North Korea and Iraq, but Bush also sought to mend relations with Latin America, a region he rarely visited during his first term and where much of the public and their governments have opposed the U.S. presence in Iraq. Key to thawing relations with Mexico is a guest-worker plan that Fox has lobbied for since Bush was first elected. Earlier this year, Bush outlined a plan that would allow 8 million undocumented immigrants to be eligible for temporary legal status in the United States for at least six years, as long as they are employed. The proposal has been stalled in Congress largely because of opposition from conservative Republicans who fear it would end up a general amnesty for illegal immigrants.

**Extinction**

**Shifter**, Inter-American Dialogue president, **2012b**(Michael, “Remaking the Relationship: The United States and Latin America,” April, IAD Policy Report, <http://www.thedialogue.org/PublicationFiles/IAD2012PolicyReportFINAL.pdf>, DOA: 2-9-13, ldg)

**There are compelling reasons for the U**nited **S**tates **and Latin America to pursue more robust ties. Every country** in the Americas **would benefit from strengthened and expanded economic relations, with improved access to each other’s markets, investment capital, and energy resources.** Even with its current economic problems, **the United States’ $16-trillion economy is a vital market and source of capital (including remittances) and technology for Latin America, and it could contribute more to the region’s economic performance**. For its part, **Latin America’s rising economies will inevitably become more and more crucial to the United States’ economic future. The U**nited **S**tates and many nations of Latin America and the Caribbean **would** also **gain a great deal by more cooperation on such global matters as climate change,** nuclear non-proliferation, **and democracy and human rights.** With a rapidly expanding US Hispanic population of more than 50 million, the cultural and demographic integration of the United States and Latin America is proceeding at an accelerating pace, setting a firmer basis for hemispheric partnership Despite the multiple opportunities and potential benefits, **relations** between the United States and Latin America **remain disappointing . If new opportunities are not seized, relations will likely continue to drift apart** **. The longer the current situation persists, the harder it will be to reverse course and rebuild vigorous cooperation . Hemispheric affairs require urgent attention**—both from the United States and from Latin America and the Caribbean.

**Semi Conductors**

**2NC**

**CIR and visas key to Semiconductor dominance**

**Rosso 13**

[Dan, journalist for the Semiconductor Industry Association, “Senate Immigration Reform Bill Would Help Spur Semiconductor Industry Growth, Innovation,” PR Newswire, 4/17, <http://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/senate-immigration-reform-bill-would-help-spur-semiconductor-industry-growth-innovation-203400651.html>]

The Semiconductor Industry Association (**SIA), representing U.S. leadership in semiconductor manufacturing** and design, today **applauded the introduction of bipartisan Senate legislation that would reform America's high-skilled immigration system** by allowing graduate students born outside the United States to apply for a green card and remain in the U.S. after receiving an advanced degree in a science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) discipline from an American university, and **by expanding the H-1B visa program**. The Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act of 2013 was introduced today by the bipartisan "Gang of Eight" – Sens. Michael Bennet (D-Colo.), Richard Durbin (D-Ill.), Robert Menendez (D-N.J.), Chuck Schumer (D-N.Y.), Jeff Flake (R-Ariz), Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.), John McCain (R-Ariz.) and Marco Rubio (R-Fla.) – and now awaits action from the Senate Judiciary Committee. ¶ "**For too long, America's outdated high-skilled immigration system has been an obstacle to U.S. innovation, job creation and economic growth**," said Brian Toohey, president and CEO, Semiconductor Industry Association. "**The Gang of Eight legislation marks a critical and long-overdue step toward fixing this broken system so that companies in the U.S. semiconductor industry and throughout the broader technology sector have access to the best and brightest minds from around the world**. SIA commends the bipartisan group in the Senate for developing this compromise legislation, and we look forward to continuing to work with leaders in Congress to improve the bill further throughout the legislative process."¶ The **legislation would exempt from the green card cap foreign nationals who graduate from an American university with a master's degree in a STEM field or a Ph.D.**, allowing these students to apply for a green card and remain in the U.S. after receiving their advanced degree. **Under current law, many of these students are forced to leave the U.S. after graduation**, **causing the U.S. to forfeit much-needed jobs and expertise to our competitors abroad.**¶ **The bill also would expand the H-1B visa program for highly educated workers who want to fill open jobs in the U.S**. **Earlier this month, the U.S. government reached the H-1B visa limit within one week of accepting applications, illustrating the overwhelming demand** for skilled immigrant workers in the high tech community.¶ **Additionally, the legislation would ramp up efforts to increase the number of American STEM graduates by raising employer green card fees to generate revenue for strengthening targeted STEM education programs**.¶ "**The country's need for highly skilled and educated workers has never been greater, and the time for meaningful immigration reform is now**," said Toohey. "**This legislation helps move the ball forward**; now we must work together to get high-skilled immigration reform over the goal line."

**Key to radiation hardening**

**Lieberman 3** (Joseph, United States Senator, “White Paper: National Security Aspects of the Global Migration of the U.S. Semiconductor Industry”, 6-5, http://www.votesmart.org/speech\_detail.php?sc\_id=86505&keyword=&ph rase=&contain=)

The Pentagon's Advisory Group on Electron Devices (AGED) has warned that the Department of Defense (**DoD**) **faces shrinking advantages across all technology areas due to the rapid decline of the U.S. semiconductor industry**, **and** that the **off-shore movement** of intellectual capital and industrial capability, particularly **in microelectronics, has** **impacted the ability of the U.S. to research and produce the best technologies** and products for the nation and the war-fighter. This global migration has also been discussed in a recently released National Research Council/National Academy of Sciences report on the U.S. semiconductor industry, which details the significant growth in foreign programs that support national and regional semiconductor industries. This support is fueling the structural changes in the global industry, and encouraging a shift of U.S. industry abroad.  
CRITICAL NATIONAL SECURITY APPLICATIONS  
Studies have shown that **numerous advanced defense applications now under consideration will require high-end components** with performance levels beyond that which is currently available. These cutting-edge devices will be required for critical defense capabilities in areas such as synthetic aperture radar, electronic warfare, and image compression and processing. **Defense needs in the near future will** also **be focused on** very high performance for missile guidance ("fire and forget"), signal processing, and **radiation-hardened chips to withstand the extreme environments of space-based communications and tactical environments**. There are profound needs for much more advanced onboard processing capabilities for unmanned aerial vehicles undertaking both reconnaissance and attack missions, for cruise missiles and ballistic missile defense, and for the infrastructure that connects these systems.   
As the military transforms to a "network-centric" force in the future, the DoD's Global Information Grid will demand extremely high-performance computation to overcome the technical barriers to a seamless communication network between terrestrial 24 and 48 color optical fiber and satellite platforms transmitting in 100+Mbps wireless. Such performance will also be necessary for "last-mile" extremely high-speed connectivity to platforms and to the soldier in the field, as well as for the high-speed encryption requirements for a secure communication system. Intelligence agencies will increasingly need the most advanced chips for very high-speed signal processing and data analysis, for real-time data evaluation, for sensor input and analysis, and for encryption and decryption.  
As studies for DARPA have indicated, the next several generations of integrated circuits, which emerge at roughly eighteen-month intervals as predicted by Moore's Law, offer the potential for exponential gains in defense war-fighting capability. It is erroneous to believe that future U.S. war-fighting capability will be derived from chips one or two generations behind current state-of-the-art technology. Many of the integrated circuits and processing platforms that are coming in to use, and which are at the heart of DoD defense strategies, are clearly at the cutting edge in their capabilities.  
**With** the **dramatic new capabilities** enabled by rapidly evolving chip technologies, **DoD** and the intelligence agencies **will need to be first adopters of the most advanced integrated circuits, and** will be **increasingly dependent** **on** such **chips for a defense** and intelligence **edge**. **If the** ongoing **migration of the chip** manufacturing **sector continues to East Asia, DoD** and our intelligence services **will lose** both **first** access **and assured** **access** to secure advanced chip-making capability, at the same time that these components are becoming a crucial defense technology advantage. Informed elements of the intelligence community therefore have made clear that relying on integrated circuits fabricated outside the U.S. (e.g. in China, Taiwan and Singapore) is not an acceptable national security option.

**Space weapons inevitable --- hardening is key to effectiveness --- solves global WMD conflict --- particularly in South Asia**

**Miller 2** (John J., Senior Editor – National Review, “Our 'Next Manifest Destiny': America Should Move to Control Space -- Now, and Decisively”, National Review, 7-15, Lexis)

**The** **U**nited **S**tates **is the world's frontrunner in space**, with about 110 military satellites in operation, compared with about 40 for Russia and 20 for the rest of the world. **Yet a leadership role in space is not the same as dominance, and** **the** **U**nited **S**tates **today lacks the ability to defend its assets against rudimentary ASAT technology or to deny other countries their own weapons in space**. No country appears to be particularly close to putting weapons in orbit, though the Chinese are expected to launch their first astronaut in the next year or two and they're working hard to upgrade their military space capabilities. "**It would be a mistake to underestimate the rapidity with which other states are beginning to use space-based systems to enhance their security**," says the just-released annual report of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute. At a U.N. disarmament conference two years ago, Chinese officials called for a treaty to keep weapons out of space -- a possible sign that what they really want is some time to play catch-up. The private sector also requires a secure space environment. When the Galaxy IV satellite failed in 1998, paging services shut down, affecting an estimated 44 million customers. Banks and credit-card companies also were affected, along with a few television and radio stations. Saddam Hussein may lack the rocket power to lob a nuclear warhead halfway around the world, but he could mount one on top of a Scud and fire it straight upward. A nuclear explosion in low orbit could disable scores of satellites and wreak havoc on modern economies everywhere -- an example of space-age terrorism. Plenty of people inside the government already recognize how much the United States relies on space. There's a U.S. Space Command headquartered in Colorado Springs, and each branch of the military is to some extent involved in space power. In 1999, secretary of defense William Cohen called space power "as important to the nation as land, sea, and air power." His successor, Donald Rumsfeld, chaired a commission on space and national security right before joining the Bush administration. The panel's report, issued last year, warned of a "Space Pearl Harbor" if the country doesn't develop "new military capabilities." While Cohen's rhetoric was fine, his boss, Bill Clinton, didn't seem to agree with it. Rumsfeld is friendly to the notion of space power, but President Bush so far hasn't talked much about it. When Bush gave his missile-defense speech at the National Defense University a year ago, he spoke of land-, sea-, and air-based defenses -- but made no mention of space. "A lot of us noticed that," says one Air Force officer. The Rumsfeld commission also emphasized defense: how to protect American satellites from foreign enemies. It had almost nothing to say about offense: how to use space for projecting American power around the globe. The commission was a creature of consensus, so this does not necessarily represent Rumsfeld's own thinking. And defense certainly is important. Military satellites are tempting targets because they're so crucial to the United States in so many ways. They are protected by their remoteness, but not much else. **Their frail bodies and predictable flight paths are a skeet shoot compared with hitting speedy ICBMs**, an ability that the United States is just starting to master. **They're also vulnerable to jamming and hacking. Hardening their exteriors**, providing them with some maneuverability, and having launch-on-demand replacements available **are all key ingredients to national security**. Yet defense doesn't win wars. In the future, the mere act of protecting these assets won't be enough to preserve American military superiority in space. In addition to an assortment of high-tech hardware, the United States could use an Alfred Thayer Mahan for the 21st century. In 1890, Mahan was a captain in the Navy when the first edition of his book, The Influence of Sea Power on World History, was published. Today it ranks among the classic texts of military theory. Mahan argued that nations achieve greatness only if they dominate the seas and their various geographic "pressure points," holding up the example of the British Royal Navy. One of Mahan's early readers was a young man named Theodore Roosevelt, who began to apply these ideas while working in the Department of the Navy during the 1890s, and later as president. Mahanian principles shook the country loose from its traditional strategy of coastal defense and underwrote a period of national dynamism, which included the annexation of Hawaii, victory in the Spanish-American War, and the construction of the Panama Canal. No writer has clearly become the Mahan of space, though one candidate is Everett C. Dolman, a professor at the Air Force's School of Advanced Airpower Studies, in Alabama. Dolman's new book Astropolitik offers a grand strategy that would have the United States "endeavor at once to seize military control of low-Earth orbit" and impose "a police blockade of all current spaceports, monitoring and controlling all traffic both in and out." Dolman identifies low-Earth orbit as a chokepoint in the sense of Mahan -- anybody who wants access to space must pass through it. "The United States should grab this vital territory now, when there's no real competition for it," Dolman tells me. "Once we're there, we can make sure the entry cost for anybody else wanting to achieve space control is too high. Whoever takes space will dominate Earth." Dolman would benefit from a political benefactor. Mahan enjoyed the patronage of Roosevelt, who took a scholar's ideas and turned them into policies. Space has a number of advocates within the military bureaucracy, mostly among its younger members. It does not have a political champion, with the possible exception of Sen. Bob Smith, a New Hampshire Republican who has made the subject a personal passion. Smith calls space America's "next Manifest Destiny" and believes the Department of Defense should establish an independent Space Force to serve alongside the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Smith, however, may not stay in the Senate much longer, facing stiff political challenges at home. With the right mix of intellectual firepower and political muscle, the United States could achieve what Dolman calls "hegemonic control" of space. The goal would be to make the heavens safe for capitalism and science while also protecting the national security of the United States. "Only those spacecraft that provide advance notice of their mission and flight plan would be permitted in space," writes Dolman. Anything else would be shot down. That may sound like 21st-century imperialism, which, in essence, it would be. But is that so bad? **Imagine that the** **U**nited **S**tates currently **maintained a battery of space-based lasers. India and Pakistan could inch toward nuclear war over Kashmir, only to be told that any attempt** by either side **to launch a missile would result in a** boost-phase **blast from outer space**. **Without taking sides, the** **U**nited **S**tates **would immediately defuse a tense situation and keep the skies** above Bombay and Karachi **free of mushroom clouds**. Moreover, **Israel would receive protection from Iran and Iraq, Taiwan from China, and Japan and South Korea from the** mad dictator **north** of the DMZ. **The** **U**nited **S**tates **would be covered** as well, able not merely **to deter aggression**, but also to defend against it.

**IL – CIR K2 Semiconductor Industry**

**High skilled immigration key to semi-conductor leadership**

**Sweeney 8 (**Eddie, Chair – Semiconductor Industry Association Semiconductor Workforce Strategy Committee, “Need for Green Cards for Skilled Workers”, CQ Congressional Testimony, 6-12, Lexis)

The need for a U.S. innovation agenda is becoming more evident every day. Better, faster, and cheaper chips are driving increased productivity and create jobs throughout the economy. For over three decades the industry has followed Moore's Law, under which the industry has doubled the number of circuits on a single chip so that today the cost of making one million circuits is one penny. **Given the ubiquity of semiconductor devices, and its central position in the U.S. economy, it is critical that the U.S. continues to lead in this technology. Yet, increasingly other nations are challenging along various points in the value chain**. For example, in 2002 31 percent of new semiconductor manufacturing equipment was sold in the U.S., an indication that the U.S. was maintaining a reasonable share of leading edge semiconductor manufacturing capacity. Today, a mere five years later, only 16 percent is sold in the U.S. **We are approaching a critical crossroad. The semiconductor technology advances that have enabled the information age are projected to end around 2020 as we reach the** physical and other **limits of our ability to pack more circuits on each** semiconductor **chip** using current technology. **At that point, revolutionary new nanotechnologies will be needed. The basic research discoveries** on which these new technologies depend **must be made today if the technologies will be available for commercialization about a decade from now**. Simply put, as we approach the fundamental limits of the current technology which has driven the high tech industry, **the country whose companies are first to market** in the subsequent technology transition **will likely lead the coming nanoelectronics era the way the U.S. has led for half a century in microelectronics. Immigration reform plays a critical role in ensuring that America earns this leadership position**. With this broader context in mind, I would now like to move to the specifics of the immigration issue, focusing on three specific topics: --The critical role that immigrants play in maintaining U.S. leadership and how U.S. immigration policy is undermining our ability to compete; --SIA's work with the IEEE-USA to develop a consensus position on green card reform, and --SIA's support for the H.R. 5882, H.R. 5921, and H.R. 6039. **Immigrants play a critical role in maintaining U.S. leadership, yet U.S. immigration policy undermines our ability to compete** The number of foreign engineers hired by the semiconductor industry is relatively small - about 1,628 new H-1B hires (as opposed to lateral hires) in 2007. The number would, of course, be larger if the H-1B was not subject to a cap, but even in past years when the cap was substantially higher, the industry's H-1B hires were around 3,000. The relatively small numbers belie the important role that foreign workers play in the success of the semiconductor companies. **Foreign nationals comprise half of the masters and 71 percent of the PhDs gradating from U.S. universities in the engineering fields needed to design and manufacture the complex circuits that are embodied in silicon chips. They play an important role in performing** the **research** to continue **to increase the density of circuits on each chip, finding ways to lower manufacturing costs, developing and launching new products, and providing applications expertise to help customers to design-in new semiconductors in their electronic systems**. By lending their particular talents, our foreign employees are creating the jobs in other parts of the company such as administration and production. Since **foreign workers are vital to the success of semiconductor companies**, they try to incorporate them as a permanent part of the workforce. SIA's workforce committee survey found that **companies are seeking permanent resident status for 97% of their HB hires**. The **caps on green cards are** thus **a major problem for the industry**. The industry is currently seeking permanent residency for about 3,800 employees. About 20% of these employees were hired four or more years ago. **While waiting**, these **employees** continue to be under the restrictions of the H-1B visas program such as limitations on their ability to move or be promoted and on their spouse's ability to work. Needless to say, individuals **become frustrated and some seek alternatives** - either with another employer or with the same employer's offshore operations. One SIA member, LSI Corporation, reported that within the past year it had six employees leave the country based on the fact that they grew tired of the green card process, several of whom went to work for another company. Another SIA company, Texas Instruments reports that four years ago it hired a design engineer with a masters in electrical engineering from Georgia Tech. He is now the lead designer on some key new products in a growing business segment and his impact on net revenue has been close to $1.75M with projections to go up to $5M in the next few years. He was hired on an H-1B visa while awaiting permanent resident status. Originally from India, he likely faces several more years of wait time. My company, National Semiconductor, has a Product Quality Management engineer with a masters degree from the University of Texas at Arlington who is an Indian national. He was hired in 2001 and had worked at National Semiconductor's chip fabrication plant in Arlington, Texas for 6 years. His skill and expertise from working at this facility made him an ideal candidate for a position that National had open for over six months which involved ensuring that new products can be efficiently manufactured at National's factories. A number of American jobs in our product design group and our factories depend on the efforts of this engineer. Since the position involved a promotion and relocation, the person had to start the green card process anew last year and absent passage of green card reform bills will likely face another four years of waiting. Our problems are not restricted to nationals facing country quota backlogs. National Semiconductor hired a design engineer 5 years ago with a masters degree in electrical engineering from Stanford University. Originally from France, he is a lead designer providing critical high speed analog design knowledge that will allow future cell phone towers to handle more data. These products are providing approximately $2M annual revenue, with a projected cumulative revenue of $15M over the next five years. He was hired on an H-1B visa and soon after a traditional labor certification application was filed on his behalf. However the Labor Department did not respond with recruitment instructions until last year, slowing the process considerably. His application for an Adjustment of Status (I-485) was finally able to be filed last summer, but he is still waiting for an approval. **Many U.S. companies are finding "work around" solutions that often involve R&D sites overseas, meaning that the downstream benefits are not flowing to the U.S. economy. We may be seeing evidence of work-arounds in the semiconductor industry**, as the percent of H-1Bs hired compared to total college hires has dropped from 57% in 2005 to 40% in 2007. The decrease is not a result of universities graduating a smaller percent of foreign students. A more likely explanation is that companies are hiring foreign students and placing them at offshore facilities. Other nations recognize the dilemma facing U.S. companies and their foreign national employees. The European Commission has recently announced its intent to issue "blue cards" which were inspired by our green cards. In announcing the plan to provide a fast and easy path to stay in Europe, the President of the European Commission declared "With the EU Blue Card we send a clear signal: Highly skilled people from all over the world are welcome in the European Union." SIA work with the IEEE-USA on broader reform Last summer, following the Senate's determined but ultimately unsuccessful effort to pass a comprehensive immigration package, the SIA concluded that the problems created by our current outdated policies regarding highly skilled immigration were too important to abandon and decided to consider new approaches to the issue. Given the difficult political issues surrounding changes to immigration policy, SIA determined that it is all the more important for parties with different viewpoints to come together and seek common understanding. With this in mind, the SIA approached the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers - United States of America (IEEE-USA), an organization whose differences with high tech associations on H-1B issues were often highlighted in media stories. Electrical and electronics engineers design the complex circuits that are embodied in silicon chips, and represent about half of the semiconductor industry's engineering workforce, making the IEEE- USA an appropriate organization to engage. IEEE-USA agreed to work with SIA to define areas of common ground focused on the ability of highly-talented individuals to get permanent resident status (green cards) in an expedited manner. In October 2007, SIA and IEEE-USA sent a letter to the House Judiciary Committee majority and minority leadership supporting efforts to attract and retain foreign professionals with advanced degrees in STEM fields as legal permanent residents. The letter specified that SIA **and IEEE-USA** both "**support legislation that will strengthen America's high tech workforce by: --Raising the employment-based immigrant visa cap**, including an exemption for foreign professionals with advanced degrees in STEM fields from U.S. universities,

**Semiconductor Leadership Good – Alt Energy**

**Semiconductor leadership is key to alt energy adoption**

**Dewey and LeBoeuf 9** (Law Firm – Semiconductor Industry Association, “Maintaining America’s Competitive Edge: Government Policies Affecting Semiconductor Industry R&D and Manufacturing Activity,” Semiconductor Industry Association, White Paper, March, http://www.sia-online.org/galleries/default-file/Competitiveness\_White\_Paper.pdf)

In addition to the direct and indirect economic benefits of the semiconductor industry itself, **semiconductors are a key technology for addressing the energy challenges that face the United States and the world**. **Semiconductors will enable society to harness alternative energy sources more effectively**, **distribute it efficiently and intelligently and consume it in the most efficient manner**, **providing an important component to our nation’s efforts to reduce the greenhouse gas emissions that cause climate change and to increase our energy security**. **Applications include power management and virtualization in computers and data centers, electronic controlled efficient motors in factories, light emitting diodes to replace compact florescent and incandescent bulbs in offices and homes, plug-in electric vehicles on highways, solar panels and wind turbines generating electricity, smart meters and sensors monitoring power lines**.

Semiconductors already are responsible for significant energy savings, and further advances in chip technology could greatly increase energy efficiency. In the home, semiconductor-enabled motor control technologies increasingly allow consumers to use smaller, more efficient motors with greater levels of performance in many household appliances, including refrigerators, dishwashers, and washing machines.

Similarly, the dramatic improvements in automobile fuel efficiency and emissions control that have been witnessed over the past decades have largely been delivered by changes in engine control electronics. Today’s vehicles have countless chip-enabled features such as gasoline direct injection, knock detection, oxygen sensors, exhaust gas recirculation, evaporative emission control systems, misfire detection, and secondary air systems. Semiconductors also play an integral role in energy-efficient hybrid cars and further advances in semiconductor technology will be critical to expanding the utility of plug-in electric vehicles by substantially extending their range and performance.

Going forward, **further advances in chip technology could produce substantial additional energy efficiencies**. Semiconductor technologies are currently in development that would allow a mobile phone to run off a single battery for extended periods of time, perhaps even years. **Advances in chip technologies are also being applied to solar power systems**. **This will enable tomorrow’s laptops and other more power intensive portable devices to** **recharge using solar power and to operate in dim ambient indoor light**.

Semiconductor technology advances in two areas of data center server activity (computation and memory) have the potential to significantly lower the energy used and heat generated by servers. During computations, which account for about 35 percent of a server’s energy draw, new chip technologies allow those parts of the processor and the server not fully engaged in an application to transition to draw reduced amounts of energy. Meanwhile new chips can also reduce energy use by up to 40 percent, even in the less energy-intensive memory arena. In addition to the direct energy savings resulting from these chip-enabled server and system efficiencies in today’s data centers, chip technologies also improve the efficiency of the industrial cooling systems that are used to ensure optimal data center service and also allow intelligent sensing, control and communication capabilities to exist in the other equipment found in the data center.

Industrial applications of new energy-saving chip technologies could improve energy efficiency in industrial settings by up to 88 percent due to more efficient motor control and power management. Chip-enabled motion and video sensors are increasingly being used in commercial and industrial settings to control lights and heating, ventilation and air conditioning systems based on movement within a room or building. Such smart facilities take on the task of making sure the environment is suitable for the worker while saving energy.

**Semiconductors also play a key role in the electronics used in both solar and windgenerated power systems**, **including solar inverters and wind turbines**, **which convert direct current from solar panels or turbines into usable household alternating current**. With the latest chip technologies, system efficiency is maximized so it can be productive even on cloudy and low wind days. **Chip technologies are also being researched to better use solar power – both natural sunlight and indoor ambient – in recharging the batteries of portable devices**. **The advances in energy efficiency and alternative energy technologies already achieved, and those projected for the future, all depend on continued innovation in semiconductor technology**, as discussed below.

**Extinction**

**Wood 10** (Duncan, Director – Program in International Relations and Canadian Studies Program – Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México, “Environment, Development and Growth: U.S.-Mexico Cooperation in Renewable Energies,” Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars – Mexico Institute, May, http://www.wilsoncenter.org/topics/pubs/U.S.%20Mexico%20Cooperation%20in%20Renewable%20Energies.pdf)

It is by now common knowledge that **the world is facing a climate change crisis caused by the effects of fossil fuel** driven industrialization. **A significant rise in global temperatures**, **combined with more severe weather conditions, more frequent floods and droughts, are bringing a paradigm shift to the way we think about our relationship with the planet**. For the first time in over 150 years policy makers are thinking seriously about decreasing dependency on fossil fuels and looking for alternatives that may be more expensive in the short and medium terms, but ultimately more sustainable. 7 All of this has happened at the same time as two other, related phenomena. The first is that **the global population is reaching new highs and by 2040‐50 will total over 9 billion people**. Experts predict that **85% of the world’s population will be located in the developing world**, **which will mean a rapidly growing demand for goods and for energy**. Both of **these factors will result in a need to** increase energy efficiency as well as **find new sources of energy**. What’s more, this massive jump in population will coincide not only with climate change but also with increasingly difficult conditions for hydrocarbons exploration and production. As most of the world’s “easy” oil has already been discovered, oil companies and nation states are turning to alternatives such a non‐conventional oil reserves (tar sands, complex fields) and reserves that in the past would have been considered unrecoverable, such as in very deep ocean waters. Furthermore, political conditions in many of the world’s oil rich regions are uncertain, unstable and often unfriendly to private oil companies and to the countries of the West. **Climate change and natural disasters** **The** **urgency of finding alternatives to fossil fuels has been confirmed in recent years by mounting scientific evidence that we are undergoing a noticeable** anthropogenic shift **in** the world’s weather and **temperature.** **Not only are a range of indicators showing that the planet is warming, but the retreat of the polar ice caps, the melting of glaciers, and most importantly in the short term extreme weather conditions and increased incidence of natural disasters have highlighted the consequences of maintaining the status quo in our patterns of energy consumption** and industrial development. It is estimated that we have experienced a 1 degree Celsius rise in global temperatures over the past 100 years and that by the end of the current century global temperatures may have risen by as much 7 or 8 degrees. Even with the reduction in greenhouse gas emissions that is contemplated by the most ambitious mitigation strategies, global temperatures may rise by as much as 6%. **This would have a dramatic and disastrous impact on both developed and developing nations and will** threaten the existence of both humans and animal and plant species. Though the connection between man‐made greenhouse gases and global warming was denied for many years by industry and governments alike, it has now been accepted that something must be done to reduce the amount of greenhouse gases released into the atmosphere. Given that 86% of all global energy comes from fossil fuels, and that these fossil fuels produce 27,000,000,000 tons of CO2 emissions annually, **finding alternative sources of energy is a crucial component of climate change mitigation strategies**.

**Semiconductor Leadership Good – Economy**

**Semiconductor leadership is key to the economy – jobs and exports**

**Dewey and LeBoeuf 9** (Law Firm – Semiconductor Industry Association, “Maintaining America’s Competitive Edge: Government Policies Affecting Semiconductor Industry R&D and Manufacturing Activity,” Semiconductor Industry Association, White Paper, March, http://www.sia-online.org/galleries/default-file/Competitiveness\_White\_Paper.pdf)

**The semiconductor industry is critically important to the** **U**nited States. **It is the second largest U.S. exporting industry**, **a major source of high-wage employment**, **a stimulus to development in a number of U.S. regions**, **and provides critical enabling technology for the rest of the U.S. and global economy**, for national defense, **for lowering the cost and improving the delivery of health care services and for advancing overall quality of life**. Semiconductors are also the enabling technology that will allow increased efficiencies for alternative energy sources, a new Smart Grid to distribute electricity, and applications such as power management that reduce energy consumption. **The U.S. semiconductor industry directly employs about 200,000 people in the United States and is the world semiconductor market share leader with 48 percent of world wide sales.** **Semiconductors have consistently been the first or second top U.S. export category over the past six years**. This export performance reflects the fact that 85 percent of global semiconductor consumption occurs outside of the United States and 80 percent of the U.S. Industry’s sales are overseas. Despite this business imperative to operate globally, about three-quarters of U.S. semiconductor industry R&D spending, 77 percent of U.S.-owned production capacity, 51 percent of U.S. industry worldwide employment, and 74 percent of the compensation and benefits paid by the U.S. industry are in the United States today. **The industry will be able to continue to generate these economic drivers in the U**nited **S**tates **if** appropriate U.S. government policies are pursued so that U**.S. producers can compete on a level playing field with their foreign competitors**, whose cost structures have benefited from very favorable foreign government tax policies and other incentives. **Data indicate that an increasing number of the U.S. semiconductor industry’s manufacturing and research facilities are being established outside the United States**, **giving rise to concerns that the United States is in danger of losing this critical aspect of its technological leadership**. Overall, the share of worldwide wafer fabrication capacity in the United States has declined from 42 percent in 1980 to 16 percent in 2007. This reflects the growth of indigenous semiconductor industries in several Asian countries as well as a shift in the U.S. industry’s investment patterns over time. While some analysts believe that it makes no difference whether this industry (or any other industry) is located in the United States, that view is not shared abroad, where an **intensive competition is being waged by national and regional governments to attract semiconductor manufacturing and research and development** (“R&D”) **investment**. **Companies** – and governments – **are operating in an increasingly competitive global marketplace**. In this environment, there is tremendous pressure for governments at all levels to devise winning strategies to attract new investments. Economic development is a top priority for most governments and the creation of a value proposition to attract foreign direct investment involves many factors, including skills, available infrastructure, incentives, and tax policies. Successful examples, both in the United States and outside the United States can be found in this paper. The question for the United States is what needs to be done in order to be more competitive and attract critical domestic and foreign investment in the United States.

**Sustained growth solves extinction**

**Austin 9** (Michael, Resident Scholar – American Enterprise Institute, and Desmond Lachman – Resident Fellow – American Enterprise Institute, “The Global Economy Unravels”, Forbes, 3-6, http://www.aei.org/article/100187)

What do these trends mean in the short and medium term? The Great Depression showed how social and **global chaos** **followed hard on economic collapse**. The mere fact that parliaments across the globe, from America to Japan, are unable to make responsible, economically sound recovery plans suggests that they do not know what to do and are simply hoping for the least disruption. Equally worrisome is the adoption of more statist economic programs around the globe, and the concurrent decline of trust in free-market systems. **The threat of instability is a pressing concern**. China, until last year the world's fastest growing economy, just reported that 20 million migrant laborers lost their jobs. Even in the flush times of recent years, **China faced** upward of **70,000 labor uprisings a year**. **A sustained downturn poses grave and possibly immediate threats to Chinese internal stability**. The regime in Beijing may be faced with a choice of repressing its own people or diverting their energies outward, leading to conflict with China's neighbors. **Russia**, an oil state completely dependent on energy sales, **has had to put down riots in its Far East as well as in downtown Moscow**. Vladimir Putin's rule has been predicated on squeezing civil liberties while providing economic largesse. If that devil's bargain falls apart, then **wide-scale repression inside Russia, along with a** continuing **threatening posture toward** Russia's **neighbors**, **is likely**. Even apparently stable societies face increasing risk and the threat of internal or possibly external conflict. As Japan's exports have plummeted by nearly 50%, one-third of the country's prefectures have passed emergency economic stabilization plans. Hundreds of thousands of temporary employees hired during the first part of this decade are being laid off. Spain's unemployment rate is expected to climb to nearly 20% by the end of 2010; Spanish unions are already protesting the lack of jobs, and the specter of violence, as occurred in the 1980s, is haunting the country. Meanwhile, in Greece, workers have already taken to the streets. **Europe as a whole will face dangerously increasing tensions** between native citizens and immigrants, largely from poorer Muslim nations, who have increased the labor pool in the past several decades. Spain has absorbed five million immigrants since 1999, while nearly 9% of Germany's residents have foreign citizenship, including almost 2 million Turks. The xenophobic labor strikes in the U.K. do not bode well for the rest of Europe. **A prolonged global downturn**, **let alone a collapse**, **would dramatically raise tensions inside these countries**. **Couple that with** possible protectionist legislation in the United States, **unresolved ethnic and territorial disputes in all regions of the globe** and a loss of confidence that world leaders actually know what they are doing. **The result may be a series of small explosions that coalesce into a big bang**.

**Semiconductor Leadership Good – EMP**

**Lack of hardened semiconductors encourages EMP attacks against the U.S.**

**Spring 94** (Baker, Researcher – Heritage Foundation, Backgrounder, http://www.heritage.org/Research/NationalSecurity/BG987.cfm)

In addition to ensuring the reliability of the existing stockpile, testing has other important and practical uses. Nuclear tests will be required to field new systems as previous generations of weapons become old and obsolete. No testing means no modernization, which means, ultimately, no nuclear stockpile. Moreover, testing is used to "harden" conventional weapons and non-nuclear defenses by exposing them to the effects of nuclear explosions. If these systems are not hardened, a regional adversary will be **tempted** to explode a nuclear weapon in the air in order to knock out these non-nuclear systems. (The U.S. ability to produce semiconductors that are hardened against the radiation emitted by nuclear weapons is weakening. For a discussion of this alarming problem, see: Lt. Col. Bill Swiderek, "Evaluating the Viability of Rad-Hard Fab Lines," Military & Aerospace Electronics, September 20, 1993, pp. 4, 14-15.)

**An EMP attack is likely – it causes meltdowns, economic collapse, and resource shortages**

**Cooper and Pfaltzgraff 12-14** (Henry F., Chairman of the Board of Directors of High Frontier and Chairman Emeritus of Applied Research Associates – Empact America, and Robert L., President – Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis and Shelby Cullom Davis Professor of International Security Studies – Tufts University, “A Dangerous Gap in Our Defenses?,” National Review Online, 12-14, http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/255192/dangerous-gap-our-defenses-henry-f-cooper-brrobert-l-pfaltzgraff-jr)

The 2004 Report of the Commission to Assess the Threat to the United States from Electromagnetic Pulse (EMP) Attack observed that a single nuclear weapon exploded at high altitude above the United States will interact with the Earth’s atmosphere, ionosphere, and magnetic field and can produce **a damaging electromagnetic pulse over hundreds of square miles**. This **could shut down**, **for an indefinite period**, **telecommunications and electrical-power grids,** **as well as the electronics-dependent transportation systems that support the “just-in-time” marketing, manufacturing, and delivery of essentially all commodities upon which we are dependent**. **It could cut off water and food supplies** to urban areas **and create chaos that would return the United States to 19th-century life, but without the life support then provided by an indigenous agricultural society**. **It could also hobble banking and related business transactions**, **which in turn could extend the catastrophic effects into the global economy**. Disabling even one of our critical infrastructure elements would have severe consequences for others — effects from which advanced, technologically interdependent societies might not easily recover.

**This threat is not merely hypothetical**. Several years ago, **Iran** **tested a short-range ballistic missile** in a way **that** **indicated an interest in developing an EMP capability**. **Even terrorists might purchase such missiles**, possibly armed with nuclear weapons. Furthermore, recent reports that **Iran has agreed to install ballistic missiles in Venezuela suggest that we could face a threat via future pathways across the Caribbean**. This could become a modern version of the Cuban Missile Crisis. **Yet no national strategy addresses this threat or underwrites a serious program to counter its effects** — though such a capability would be possible as an inexpensive adjunct to existing and planned missile-defense programs.

[Continues]

**America’s current state of essentially complete vulnerability to the EMP threat is unacceptable**, especially since relatively inexpensive steps can be taken now to build missile-defense systems that would begin to counter this 21st-century threat. Existing, already-funded programs will improve possible near-term capabilities, which can begin initial operations by 2015. The confusion over what produced the vapor trail off the California coast in early November, along with the potential threat from Venezuela, should inspire action to fill a gap that, if unaddressed, could have catastrophic consequences for our security.

**Semiconductor Leadership Good – Space**

**Semiconductor leadership is key to space colonization**

**Kranz 8** (Gene, Staff Writer – San Jose Mercury News, “Silicon Valley, the moon and Mars”, 5-14, Lexis)

NASA hosts a forum today in San Jose to preview its ambition to return America to the moon and propel us to Mars and beyond. The setting is ideal - in the heart of Silicon Valley. **Much of the innovation and creativity in the nation's space program** over the past 50 years **can be tied directly to Silicon Valley**, a model for technical progress and economic growth. **There's a tradition of space research leading to advances in commercial technology, and of commercial technology benefiting space research**. This reciprocal relationship is as strong as ever today, bolstering this nation's position as a powerhouse of innovation. Leading-edge research The collaboration is evident at NASA/Ames Research Center in Mountain View. Ames is carrying out leading-edge research in high-performance computing, networking, advanced number-crunching software, visual displays, 3-D graphics and artificial intelligence. Work is also under way on tele-operations - linking the human touch to the work of a robot far off Earth - as well as telepresence that allows a person to feel as if he or she is actually present in a different place or time. Projects like these have the potential to create "disruptive technologies" benefiting humankind. The efforts support NASA's aeronautical and space agenda, but they also have the potential to be spun off into commercial technologies. Ames also runs a cooperative laboratory, dubbed CoLab, in which partnerships between space agency projects and tech-savvy communities are fostered. In collaboration with Bay Area entrepreneurs, CoLab is developing open-source software, permitting teams of NASA and non-NASA participants to brainstorm and execute new initiatives in what's being called "participational space exploration." For example, the social networking site and virtual community Second Life has been used to engage the public in space exploration. In yet another collaboration, Ames and Google have signed a Space Act Agreement to work together on a variety of challenging technical problems ranging from large-scale data management and massively distributed computing to human-computer interfaces. Ames is located amid the high-tech companies, universities and laboratories that define Silicon Valley. It's natural that Silicon Valley would be at the forefront of blending space exploration with cutting-edge information technology work. Space meets cyberspace. There's been a long and rich history of space research leading to advances in commercial technology, with much of the spinoff benefits evident in the valley. **Reaching for the moon** in the 1960s **was not only a challenge for NASA, but also for early semiconductor companies**. **Integrated circuitry had to be "space-qualified." That standard called for extremely high-quality electronics, packing more power than ever before while being packaged in ultra-small formats**. As companies perfected production techniques, prices for integrated circuits dropped. Apollo's legacy The Apollo program helped spur developments from cordless tools and hospital monitoring equipment to water purification technologies. Even the Apollo flight simulator - which used a fraction of the computing power of today's Microsoft Xbox or Nintendo game systems - can be linked to the popularization of video games, now a multibillion-dollar industry. NASA marks its 50th anniversary this year. It's a good time to reflect on the trailblazing space research that both drew from and helped stimulate this country's technological aptitude. Bringing space down to Earth, for the benefit of our economy, productivity and knowledge, can boost U.S. leadership in an increasingly competitive world.

**Solves inevitable extinction**

**Carreau 2** (Mark, Winner – 2006 Space Communicator Award, MA in Journalism – Kansas State University, “Top Experts See Space Study As Key to Human Survival”, The Houston Chronicle, 10-19, Lexis)

With Apollo astronaut John Young leading the charge, top aerospace experts warned Friday that humanity's survival may depend on how boldly the world's space agencies venture into the final frontier. Only a spacefaring culture with the skills to travel among and settle planets can be assured of escaping a collision between Earth and a large asteroid or devastation from the eruption of a super volcano, they told the World Space Congress. "Space exploration is **the key to the future of the human race**," said Young, who strolled on the moon more than 30 years ago and now serves as the associate director of NASA's Johnson Space Center. "We should be running scared to go out into the solar system. We should be running fast." Scientists believe that an asteroid wiped out the dinosaurs more than 60 million years ago, and are gathering evidence of previously large collisions. "The civilization of Earth does not have quite as much protection as we would like to believe," said Leonid Gorshkov, an exploration strategist with RSC Energia, one of Russia's largest aerospace companies. "We should not place all of our eggs in one basket."

**Space Science**

**2NC**

**Visa limits send a signal that crushes international cooperation essential to space science – certainty is key**

**Abbey and Lane 5** (George, Senior Fellow in Space Policy – Baker Institute and Neal, Professor of Physics – Rice University, “United States Space Policy: Challenges and Opportunities”, http://www.bakerinstitute.org/publications /wp\_aaas\_spacePolicy.pdf)

Though these **foreign-born individuals are an integral part of the continued success of the** **U**nited **St**ates **in scientific and technological endeavors**, export controls inhibit precisely the type of study that attracts these talented individuals and the research collaboration that benefits U.S. science and technology. While not the subject of this paper, **the cumbersome and slow visa approval process compounds the problem by making it much less attractive for foreigners to** come to the United States to study, attend conferences, or **collaborate on research projects**. In a survey of 126 institutions released in October of 2004, the Council of Graduate Schools found an 18-percent decrease in admissions of foreign graduate students in the fall of 2004 compared with the fall of 2003. The graduate school council expected actual enrollments of new foreign graduate students to be down by an amount similar to the 18-percent fall in admissions.16 The NSB identifies three possible outcomes of these trends in the growth and composition of the S&E workforce: “**The number of jobs in the U.S. economy that require science and engineering training will grow; the number of U.S. citizens prepared for those jobs will, at best, be level; and the availability of people from other countries who have science and engineering training will decline**, either **because of visa restrictions** or because of intense global competition for people with these skills.”17 The NSB report also notes that actions taken today to alter trends in the U.S. S&E workforce may require 10 to 20 years to take effect. “The students entering the science and engineering workforce in 2004 with advanced degrees decided to take the necessary math courses to enable this career path when they were in middle school, up to 14 years ago. The students making that same decision in middle school today won’t complete advanced training for science and engineering occupations until 2018 or 2020. **If action is not taken now to change these trends, we could reach 2020 and find that the ability of U.S. research and education institutions to regenerate has been damaged and that their preeminence has been lost to other areas of the world**.”18 Comparison between the U.S. and other industrial nations, as shown in Table 2, clearly illustrates this critical national problem. **Concurrent** with these educational challenges, **the** **U**nited **S**tates **faces daunting demographic shifts**. **The** American **workforce is aging**; over the past 20 years the prime-age (25–56) workforce grew 44 percent, but **it will have zero growth over the next twenty years**.19 In addition, the increase in the share of workers with post–high school education grew 19 percent during the last twenty years and is projected to grow only 4 percent over the next twenty years. **These statistics**, when compared to numbers from the NSB’s Science and Engineering Indicators 2004, raise **concern about future S&E needs**. The report notes that the number of jobs requiring S&E skills in the U.S. labor force is growing almost 5 percent per year. By comparison, the rest of the labor force is growing at just over 1 percent. Before September 11, 2001, the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) projected that S&E occupations would increase at three times the rate of all occupations. The rise projected by the BLS was 2.2 million, representing a 47-percent increase in the number of S&E jobs by 2010. The rates of increase between 1980 and 2000 ranged from 18 percent for the life sciences to 123 percent for jobs in math and computer science.20 The average age of the S&E workforce is rising. Many of those who entered the expanding S&E workforce in the 1960s and 1970s (the baby boom generation) are expected to retire in the next 20 years. The children of that generation are not choosing careers in S&E in the same numbers as their parents. During the 1950s and 60s, the U.S. government invested heavily in research and development (R&D). Government research laboratories and agencies conducted a substantial amount of in-house research. This led to the creation of a workforce with significant technical and management capabilities. The National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics had outstanding technical skills and potential. The Army Ballistic Missile Agency, formed with Werner Von Braun and his team of scientists and engineers, was equally well qualified. These two groups formed the nucleus of NASA. Within the contractor community, there was a highly qualified workforce that had conducted aeronautical research from the end of World War II through the 1960s. They pushed the limits of aeronautical research with their aircraft and research vehicles and arrived at the edge of space with the X-15. NASA grew to approximately 36,000 employees during the 1960s. That organization today employs approximately 18,000 people. **Over the past few years,** the **aerospace** industry **has been unable to develop the experienced workforce that they had during the** 19**60s** **due to consolidations and the absence of new programs**. These are important factors in assessing whether the skill base exists to implement a major new space program.¶ [CONTINUES]¶ **One of the most important questions plaguing** the current **NASA** Plan **is the degree to which other nations will be invited to join the** **U**nited **S**tates **as true partners and to participate in the early planning stages of future human exploration missions**. President Bush, in his speech of January 14, 2004, appeared to invite other nations to share the challenges and opportunities of his vision and the new era of discovery. However, NASA leadership subsequently contradicted that promise when then-NASA Administrator Sean O’Keefe stated that the new space initiative was “very much going to be a U.S. led endeavor. That’s our intent. And, again, much of what we had been directed and what the President envisions we do is to achieve this set of American, U.S. exploration objectives.”23 This is not an invitation to partnership. Partnership, of course, does not exclude national objectives, but it does require a sharing of vision, objectives, and commitments, at the earliest stages of planning. Otherwise, the United States cannot expect other nations to participate enthusiastically and to provide the necessary staffing and funding. Based on the authors’ conversations, it is clear that **scientists, engineers, and policy makers around the world perceive that the** **U**nited **S**tates **has no interest in bringing other nations into the planning process**, though it expects them to take on the operation of the space station and to provide assistance for other U.S.-led space efforts when asked. **Given the present limited U.S. capability to undertake a major program such as returning humans to the Moon and sending them, eventually, to Mars, it is clear that international cooperation is necessary for these missions**. Furthermore, even if the United States had all the necessary resources, why would it make sense to go it alone in the scientific and human exploration of space? **For international cooperation to be a realistic possibility the** **U**nited **S**tates **will have to take a very different approach to prospective partnerships, in tone and in substance**. **Whatever path** the United States chooses to follow with its policies, **America does not have a future in space—human exploration, space science, or commercial space activities—without considerable international cooperation**. **The degree of cooperation** that will be **necessary will not be possible under current** export control and other **restrictive policies**. The International Space Station and the Space Shuttle programs, as well as many of the most successful robotic science missions, were accomplished with considerable international involvement and the free exchange of data and technical information. Neither of these programs could have been successful under any other conditions. **The creation of complex systems**, which operate in an integrated fashion in order **to support human life in a hostile environment, requires an international partnership, with open discussions and sharing of information and technology**. As important a role as these matters play in discouraging cooperation with the United States in space, the issue most threatening to cooperation may well be a growing international perception that the United States intends to control space militarily. Although it is not the subject of this paper, military space policy is a matter of profound importance to the future of U.S. civilian space programs and the space programs of other nations.24 In recent years, the United States has accelerated its efforts to put in place a primitive missile-defense system. The decision was made apparently without any international consultation and before adequate R&D and testing had shown the feasibility of such a system. This action suggested that the United States is impatient to signal to the rest of the world that it intends to treat space differently in the future than it has in the past. Many members of Congress who have been advocating for a missile-defense system for several decades heartily endorsed the decision. Powerful industrial interests are also at stake. Missile defense is only one aspect of the increased military use of space. “The Report of the Commission to Assess the United States National Security Space Management and Organization,” published in 2001, identifies the importance of space to national security and outlines a series of recommendations for the future of military space activities.25 The report proposes, among other things, that the military vigorously pursue capabilities that would enable the President to deploy weapons in space “to deter threats to and, if necessary, defend against attacks on U.S. interests.”26 This proposal represents a departure from President Kennedy’s vision of 1962, when he vowed, “We shall not see space filled with weapons of mass destruction but with instruments of knowledge and understanding.”27 Placing offensive weapons in space would be a cause for alarm throughout the world and, in the context of the issues addressed in this paper, would create a major obstacle to international cooperation in space. American companies could expect an even more restrictive U.S. export control policy. Such restrictions could further damage commercial space activities and preclude the willingness of other nations to join U.S.-led programs for both human and robotic space science and exploration missions. The placement of weapons in space would reinforce in the world community the feeling that the United States increasingly is basing its foreign policy on unilateral initiatives. As such, it would severely impact the progress that has been made over the last fifty years towards multilateral international cooperation. RECOMMENDATIONS The four barriers to progress in the U.S. space program described in this paper need not remain obstacles to future U.S. efforts in space commerce, science and technology, and human exploration. However, in order **to remove them, the** **U**nited **S**tates **will need to reassess current space policy and**, where necessary, **make corrections**. The world has changed in fundamental ways in the forty years since President Kennedy challenged the American people to take humans to the Moon and return them safely to Earth. The fear of the Cold War adversary, the Soviet Union, has been replaced by a very different, largely decentralized, fear of terrorism. The response of the U.S. government to 9/11 has been to take visible measures to improve the personal safety of American citizens. Some of those measures are placing unintended barriers in the way of progress for the U.S. space program. There is no question that the United States must, as its highest priority, protect its citizens from attacks by terrorists and other hostile forces. However, this can and should be accomplished in a manner that does not damage other national interests. Get Knowledge In and Peaceful Technologies Out **The** **U**nited **S**tates **should base its** export control and **visa policies on reason and common sense**. Clearly, the government must identify and protect critical technologies, but policies should recognize that the strength of U.S. industry depends on its ability to compete effectively in the world market. This requires exporting goods and cooperating with other countries when doing so is beneficial to American companies. Just as clearly, the United States should prevent individuals who intend to do harm from entering the country; however, the government should put in place a rational and efficient process for making that determination. **The future vitality of the U.S. aerospace industry in the increasingly competitive world market and the ability of the** **U**nited **S**tates **to undertake major cooperative space-science and human-exploration endeavors**, as suggested by the President, **depend on the revision of** American export controls and other **overly restrictive policies**. **The international community believes that U.S. rules currently display arrogance and a mistaken assumption that the development of advanced technologies is unique to the** **U**nited **S**tates. That the United States is alone in its level of technological development clearly is not the case, nor has it been for some time. The United States must protect its citizens and prevent the proliferation of potentially dangerous technologies. However, restrictions on U.S. products are ineffective, even counterproductive, when substitutes for regulated products exist on the world market. In this situation, embargos and regulations serve no purpose. The United States should identify satellite technologies and processes that are unique and vital to national security interests, hence appropriate for licensing by the State Department under ITAR. All other exports of satellites and satellite components and technologies should be licensed by the Commerce Department. If rational steps are taken to review and modify the U.S. policy on export controls, not only will satellite and related industries be better positioned to compete in the world space market, but such actions might also foster U.S. cooperation with other nations in space activities. As the United States prepares for future space science and human exploration, possibly with an expanded role for industry, as outlined in “A Journey to Innovate, Inspire, and Discover,” the report of the President’s Commission on Implementation of United States Space Exploration Policy, the best route will be through strong international cooperation, where collaborators share the costs as well as the benefits.28 While the commission did not address export controls, a serious weakness of their report, it is clear that present export control policies should be changed.

**Effective space science solves extinction**

**Killeen 5** (Timothy L., Director – National Center for Atmospheric Research, “NASA Earth Science”, CQ Congressional Testimony, 4-28, Lexis)

The first example is probably well known to you. The **ozone "holes"** in the Antarctic and Arctic **were monitored** from space **by** various N**ASA satellite systems**, including the Total Ozone Mapping Spectrometer (TOMS). The diagnosis of the physical and chemical mechanisms responsible for these dangerous changes to our protective ozone shield was made possible by the combination of observations, modeling, and theory supported by NASA. In fact, it was a **NASA** high-altitude aircraft that **made the "smoking gun" measurements that convinced the scientific and policy communities that** chlorine compounds produced by various **human activities were** centrally **responsible for** the observed **ozone loss**. **Following** these **observations, international protocols were put in place that are beginning to ameliorate** the **global-scale ozone loss**. The TOMS instrument has provided an ongoing source of data that permits us to track the level of ozone in the stratosphere, the annual opening and closing of the "ozone hole," and how this phenomenon is changing over time. These **continuing measurements** and analyses and the effective regulatory response **have led**, among other things, **to a reduction in** projected **deaths from** skin **cancer worldwide**. Last week, President Bush mentioned proposed rules to limit air pollution from coalfired power plants. **Air pollution is** clearly **an important concern. NASA has played a major role in** the **development of new technologies that can monitor the sources and circulation patterns of air pollution globally**. It is another tremendous story of science serving society through innovation. In this case, through an international collaboration, NASA deployed a one-of-a-kind instrument designed to observe global carbon monoxide and its transport from the NASA Terra spacecraft. These animations show the first global observations of air pollution. Sources of carbon monoxide include industrial processes (see, for example, source regions in the Pacific Rim) and fires (for example in Amazonia). These global-scale data from space have helped change our understanding of the relationship between pollution and air quality - we now know that pollution is not solely or even primarily a local or regional problem. California's air quality is influenced by industrial activity in Asia, and Europe's air quality is influenced by activities here in America. From such pioneering work, **operational systems can** now **be designed to observe** pollution events, **the** **global distribution of chemicals** and particulate matter **in the atmosphere**, **and the ways** in which **these substances** interact and affect the **ability of the atmosphere to sustain life** - such a system will undoubtedly underpin future efforts to understand, monitor, and manage air quality globally. **Without NASA's commitment to innovation in the Earth sciences, it is hard to believe that such an incredible new capability would be available today**. The Promise of Earth Observations in the Next Decade The achievements of the last several decades have laid the foundation for an unprecedented era of discovery and innovation in Earth system science. Advances in observing technologies have been accompanied by vast improvements in computing and data processing. When the Earth Observing System satellites were being designed, processing and archiving the data was a central challenge. The Terra satellite produces about 194 gigabytes of raw data per day, which seemed a daunting prospect at the time of its definition. Now laptop memories are measured in gigabytes, students can work with remote sensing datasets on their laptops, and a large data center like NCAR increases our data holdings by about 1000 gigabytes per day. The next generation of high performance computing systems, which will be deployed during the next five years or so, will be petascale systems, meaning that they will be able to process millions of gigabytes of data. The ongoing revolution in information technology has provided us with capabilities we could hardly conceive of when the current generation of Earth observing satellites was being developed. We have just begun to take advantage of the synergies between these technological areas. The U.S., through NASA, is uniquely positioned to take advantage of this technological opportunity. Example 3: Weather Forecasting Weather forecasting in the Southern Hemisphere has been dramatically improved through NASA's contributions, and this experience illustrates the power of remote sensing for further global improvements in weather prediction. The lack of surface- based data in the Southern Hemisphere once meant that predictive skill lagged considerably behind that achieved in the Northern Hemisphere. The improvement in the accuracy of Southern Hemisphere weather forecasting is well documented and almost entirely due to the increased use of remote-sensing data. But improvements in the quality of satellite data were not sufficient. Improvements in data assimilation a family of techniques for integrating observational results into predictive models were also necessary. The combination has resulted in rapid improvement in Southern Hemisphere forecasting, which is now nearly equal to that in northern regions. Data assimilation capabilities continue to advance rapidly. One can now easily conceive of forecast systems that will fuse data from satellites, ground-based systems, databases, and models to provide predictions with unprecedented detail and accuracy - perhaps reaching natural limits of predictability. A new generation of weather forecast models with cloud-resolving spatial resolution is coming on line, and these models show significant promise for improving forecast skills across the board. Use of new NASA remote sensing data from upcoming missions such as Calipso (Cloud- Aerosol and Infrared Pathfinder Satellite) and CloudSat will be essential to fully validate and tune these new capabilities which will serve the nation in providing improved hurricane and severe storm prediction, and in the development of numerous decision support systems reliant on state-of-the-art numerical weather prediction capabilities. Example 4: Earth System Models Data from NASA missions are central to constructing more comprehensive and detailed models that will more realistically represent the complexity of the Earth system. Cloud observations from MODIS (the Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer) and precipitation measurements from GPM (the Global Precipitation Mission), for example, are critical to improving the representation of clouds and the water cycle in such models. Observations from MODIS and Landsat are fundamental to the development of more sophisticated representation of marine and terrestrial ecosystems and atmosphere-land surface interactions. The inclusion of this detail will help in the creation of true Earth system models that will enable detailed investigation of the interactions of Earth system processes and multiple environmental stresses within physically consistent simulated systems. In general terms, Earth system observations represent the only means of validating Earth system model predictions. Our confidence in short-term, regional-scale weather predictions is based on how closely they match observed regional conditions. Assessing the performance of global-scale, longer-term model predictions likewise depends on comparing model results with observational records. Scientific confidence in the ability of general circulation models to represent Earth's climate has been greatly enhanced by comparing model results for the last century with the observational records from that period. At the same time, the sparse and uneven nature of past observational records is an ongoing source of uncertainty in the evaluation of model results. The existence of much more comprehensive and consistent global measurements from space such as the data from the NASA Terra, Aqua, and Aura satellites is a giant step forward in this regard, and, if maintained, will enable much more rigorous evaluation of model performance in the future. In summary, Earth system models, with increasing temporal and spatial resolutions and validated predictive capabilities, will be used by industry and governmental decision makers across a host of domains into the foreseeable future. This knowledge base will drive new economies and efficiencies within our society. I believe that requirements flowing from the needs and capabilities of sophisticated Earth system models will be very useful for NASA in developing strategic roadmaps for future missions. C. The Importance of Careful Planning The central role of NASA in supporting Earth system science, the demonstrated success and impact of previous and current NASA missions, and the promise of continued advances in scientific understanding and societal benefits all argue for a careful, analytical approach to major modifications in the NASA Earth science program. As noted above, the development of space systems is a time-consuming and difficult process. Today's actions and plans will have long-term consequences for our nation's capabilities in this area. The link between plans and actions is one of the most important points I want to address today. From the outside, the interagency planning process seems to be experiencing substantial difficulties in maintaining this link. The NASA Earth science program is part of two major Presidential initiatives, the Climate Change Science Program (CCSP) and the Global Earth Observation System of Systems (GEOSS). With regard to the CCSP, it is not apparent that the strategies and plans developed through the interagency process are having much impact on NASA decision-making. In January 2004, then- Administrator of NASA, Sean O'Keefe, called for acceleration of the NASA Glory mission because of the direct relevance of the mission to understanding the roles of aerosols in the climate system, which is one of the highest-priority science questions defined in the CCSP research strategy. NASA is now proposing cancellation of the mission. As I have emphasized throughout this testimony, the progress of and benefits from Earth system science research are contingent upon close coordination between research, modeling, and observations. The close coordination of program planning among the agencies that support these activities is also a necessity. This coordination currently appears to be fragile. The effect of significant redirections in NASA and reduction in NASA's Earth science effort are equally worrisome in the case of the Administration's GEOSS initiative, which is focused on improving the international coordination of environmental observing systems. Both NASA and NOAA satellite programs are vital to this effort. The science community is very supportive of the GEOSS concept and goals. There are over 100 space-based remote-sensing systems that are either operating or planned by various nations for the next decade. Collaboration among space systems, between space- and ground-based systems, and between suppliers and users of observational data is critical to avoiding duplication of effort and to getting the most out of the investments in observing technology. The tragic example of the Indian Ocean Tsunami demonstrates the need for such coordination. The tsunami was detected and observed before hitting land, but the absence of effective communication links prevented warnings from reaching those who needed them in time. A functioning GEOSS could lead to major improvements in the rapid availability of data and warnings, and the U.S. is right to make development of such a system a priority. But U.S. credibility and leadership of this initiative will be called into question if our nation is unable or unwilling to coordinate and maintain the U.S. programs that make up the core of our proposed contribution. D. Answers to Questions Posed by the Committee My testimony to this point has outlined my views on a series of key issues for the NASA Earth science program. Much of the text found above is relevant to consideration of the specific questions posed by the Committee in its letter of invitation. In this section, I provide more direct answers to these questions to the extent possible and appropriate. How should NASA prioritize currently planned and future missions? What criteria should NASA use in doing so? I believe that NASA should work with the scientific and technical community and its partner agencies to define a NASA Earth science plan that is fully compatible with the overall CCSP and GEOSS science strategies. In my view, the interaction with the scientific and technical community should include both input from and review by the National Research Council (NRC) and direct interaction with the strong national community of Earth science investigators and the aerospace industry who are very familiar with NASA capabilities and developing technological opportunities. Competitive peer review processes should be used appropriately in assessing the merit of competing approaches and in key decision- making. I believe NASA should also find a means of involving users and potential users of NASA-generated data in this process, perhaps through public comment periods or a series of workshops. Sufficient time should be allotted to this process for a careful and deliberative evaluation of options. This science plan should then guide the process of setting mission priorities. Defining criteria to use in comparing and deciding upon potential missions would be an important part of this planning exercise. I would recommend consideration of a set of criteria that include: -- compatibility with science priorities in the CCSP and GEOSS science plans -- potential scientific return from mission -- technological risk -- direct and indirect societal benefits -- cost. I believe that the decadal planning activity underway at the NRC in response to a request from NASA and NOAA is a valuable step in this process. What are the highest priority unaddressed or unanswered questions in Earth science observations from space? I believe this question is most appropriately addressed through the community process suggested above. There are many important Earth science questions, and prioritizing among them is best done in a deliberative and transparent process that involves extensive input from and discussion by the science community. I would personally cite soil moisture, three-dimensional cloud characteristics, global vector tropospheric winds, pollutant characteristics and transport, carbon fluxes, and aerosol distributions as all high priority measurements to make on a global scale. What have been the most important contributions to society that have come from NASA Earth sciences over the last decade (or two)? NASA **Earth science programs have played a key role in** developing our understanding of the Earth as a coupled system of inter- related parts, and in the **identification and documentation of a series of global-scale changes in the Earth's environment, including ozone depletion**, land use and land cover change, **loss of biodiversity, and climate change**. Other examples of societal contributions include improved weather forecasting, improved understanding of the large-scale climate variations, such as the El Nino- Southern Oscillation and the North Atlantic Oscillation that alter seasonal patterns of rainfall, and improved understanding of the status of and changes in marine and terrestrial ecosystems that contributes to more effective management of natural resources. What future benefits to the nation (societal applications) are possible that NASA Earth sciences could provide? What gaps in our knowledge must we fill before those future benefits are possible? In a broad sense, NASA **Earth science activities** are part of developing a global Earth information system that **can provide** ongoing and accurate **information about** the status of and **changes in the atmosphere, oceans, and** marine and terrestrial **ecosystems that sustain life, including the impact of human activities**. **The continued development of observation systems**, sophisticated Earth system models, data assimilation methods, and information technologies **holds the promise of much improved predictions of** weather and climate variations and much more effective prediction and warning of natural hazards. Much has already been accomplished to lay the groundwork for such a system, but **many important questions remain**. Some of the most important have to do **with** the functioning and **human** **alteration of the Earth's carbon, nitrogen, and water cycles**, and how these cycles interact; the regional manifestation of global scale climate change; and the reactions of ecosystems to simultaneous multiple stresses.

**Space Cooperation Good- Asteroids**

**International space cooperation is key to effective asteroid deflection --- solves inevitable extinction**

**Schweickart 7** (Russell L., Formerr Apollo Astronaut and Chair – B612 Foundation, New York Times, 3-16, Lexis)

AMERICANS who read the papers or watch Jay Leno have been aware for some time now that there is a slim but real possibility -- about 1 in 45,000 -- that an 850-foot-long asteroid called Apophis **could strike** Earth with catastrophic consequences on April 13, 2036. What few probably realize is that there are thousands of other space objects **that could** hit us in the next century that could **cause** severe damage, if not **total destruction**. Last week two events in Washington -- a conference on ''planetary defense'' held by the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, and the release by NASA of a report titled ''Near-Earth Object Survey and Deflection Analysis of Alternatives'' -- gave us good news and bad on this front. On the promising side, scientists have a good grasp of the risks of a cosmic fender-bender, and have several ideas that could potentially stave off disaster. Unfortunately, the government doesn't seem to have any clear plan to put this expertise into action. In 1998, Congress gave NASA's Spaceguard Survey program a mandate of ''discovering, tracking, cataloging and characterizing'' 90 percent of the near-Earth objects larger than one kilometer (3,200 feet) wide by 2008. An object that size could devastate a small country and would probably **destroy civilization**. The consensus at the conference was that the initial survey is doing fairly well although it will probably not quite meet the 2008 goal. Realizing that there are many smaller but still terribly destructive asteroids out there, Congress has modified the Spaceguard goal to identify 90 percent of even smaller objects -- 460 feet and larger -- by 2020. This revised survey, giving us decades of early warning, will go a long way toward protecting **life on the planet** in the future. The good news is that scientists feel we have the technology to intercept and deflect many asteroids headed toward Earth. Basically, if we have early enough warning, a robotic space mission could slightly change the orbit of a dangerous asteroid so that it would subsequently miss the planet. Two potential deflection techniques appear to work nicely together -- first we would deflect the asteroid with kinetic impact from a missile (that is, running into it); then we would use the slight pull of a ''gravity tractor'' -- a satellite that would hover near the asteroid -- to fine-tune its new trajectory to our liking. (In the case of an extremely large object, probably one in 100, the missile might have to contain a nuclear warhead.) To be effective, however, such missions would have to be launched 15 or even 30 years before a calculated impact. The bad news? While this all looks fine on paper, scientists haven't had a chance to try it in practice. And this is where NASA's report was supposed to come in. Congress directed the agency in 2005 to come up with a program, a budget to support it and an array of alternatives for preventing an asteroid impact. But instead of coming up with a plan and budget to get the job done, the report bluntly stated that ''due to current budget constraints, NASA cannot initiate a new program at this time.'' Representative Bart Gordon, Democrat of Tennessee, was right to say that ''NASA's recommended approach isn't a credible plan'' and that Congress expected ''a more responsive approach'' within the year. Why did the space agency drop the ball? Like all government departments, it fears the dreaded ''unfunded mandate''; Congress has the habit of directing agencies to do something and then declining to give them the money to do so. This is understandable. But in this case, Congress not only directed NASA to provide it with a recommended program but also asked for the estimated budget to support it. It was a left-handed way for the Congress to say to NASA that this is our priority like it or not. But for some reason NASA seems to have opted for a federal form of civil disobedience. Another problem with the report was that, while it outlined other possibilities, it estimated that using a nuclear-armed missile to divert an asteroid would be ''10 to 100 times more effective'' than non-nuclear approaches. It is possible that in some cases -- such as an asteroid greater than a third of a mile across -- the nuclear option might be necessary. But for the overwhelming majority of potential deflection cases, using a nuclear warhead would be like a golfer swinging away with his driver to sink a three-foot putt; the bigger bang is not always better. Why the concern? First, even with good intentions, launching a nuclear-armed missile would violate the international agreements by which all weaponry is banned from space. Second, the laws of probability say we would be struck by such a large asteroid only once every 200,000 years -- that's a long time to keep a standing arsenal of nuclear asteroid-blasters, and raises all sorts of possibilities of accidents or sabotage -- the old ''cure being worse than the disease'' phenomenon. In the end, of course, this is not just America's problem, as an asteroid strike would be felt around the globe. **The best course is international coordination on deflection technology, along with global agreements on what should be done if a collision looks likely.** Along these lines, the Association of Space Explorers, a group of more than 300 people from 30 nations who have flown in space (of which I am a member), is beginning a series of meetings in cooperation with the United Nations to work out the outlines of such an agreement. Still, as with many global issues, little will be accomplished unless the **U**nited **S**tates takes the lead. With the **entire planet in the cross hairs**, NASA can't be allowed to dither. If Congress's mandates and budget requests aren't energizing the agency, perhaps public hearings would shame it into action.

**Space Science Good – Extinction**

**NASA earth science programs are key to check extinction**

Krishna **Ramanujan**, NASA Goddard, 6-3-**2004**, “NASA plans to put an Aura around the Earth,” http://www.nasa.gov/vision/earth/environment/Aura\_feature1.html

When people search for conditions that might support life on other planets, one of the first things they look for is water. Right now, NASA is searching for signs of water on Mars as a precursor to whether life may have been possible there. But the thin sliver of gases and air that make **an atmosphere** around a planet **is** just as **necessary for life to exist.** The atmosphere traps air around our planet, making it possible to breathe and to have a climate. It also regulates the temperature within a range that allows life to exist, and our ozone layer blocks life-threatening ultraviolet radiation from the sun from reaching earth's surface. Earth's atmosphere sustains life in all these ways, and by the thinnest margins. If a person could cruise at a speed of 60 miles an hour straight up, it would take just 6 minutes to exit the air we need to survive. Considering the relatively delicacy of this thin protective film, **understanding our atmosphere goes hand in hand with protecting life as we know it.** On June 19, **NASA will launch** Aura, **a next generation Earth-observing satellite that will make global observations** of the ocean of air that surrounds our planet. **Aura will supply the best information yet about the health of Earth's atmosphere.** Answering Key Science Questions Aura will provide an essential component for understanding changes in our climate, our air quality, and the ozone layer that protects life from harmful solar radiation. In doing so, it will help answer some fundamental questions regarding climate change. One question that researchers have asked is: Is the stratospheric ozone layer is recovering? International agreements, like the Montreal Protocol, have banned ozone destroying chemicals like Chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs), but scientists are unclear about the effectiveness of these treaties. **Aura will accurately detect global levels of CFCs**, and their byproducts, chlorine and bromine, **which destroy the ozone layer.** Another question that researchers need more information to: What are the processes controlling air quality? Aura will help greatly to unravel some of these mysteries by tracking the sources and processes controlling global and regional air quality. When ozone exists in the lower atmosphere, the troposphere, it acts as an air pollutant. Gasoline and diesel engines give off gases in the summer that create ozone and smog. Aura will help scientists follow the sources of ozone and its precursors. Finally, **Aura will offer insights into** the question: How is the Earth's **climate** changing? As the composition of Earth's atmosphere changes, so does its ability to absorb, reflect and retain solar energy. Greenhouse gases, including water vapor, trap heat in the atmosphere. Airborne aerosols from human and natural sources absorb or reflect solar energy based on color, shape, size, and substance. The impact of aerosols, tropospheric ozone and upper tropospheric water vapor on Earth's climate remains largely un-quantified, but now Aura will have the unique ability to monitor these agents.

**Space Science Good – Ozone**

**NASA-led monitoring key to continued ozone recovery**

**Aerospace Daily ‘95**

(7-21, Lexis)

NASA-funded research results showing a marked decline in an ozone- depleting chemical since an international treaty limiting its production come at an opportune time for agency lobbyists. Researchers at MIT reported in the journal Science last week that methyl chloroform concentrations have dropped at a rate of about 2% a year since mid-1990, the first measured decrease in an ozone-depleting atmospheric chemical since the Montreal Protocol was established as an attempt to protect stratospheric ozone levels. NASA, which faces a determined attack by House Republicans on its Earth Observing System (EOS), was quick to issue a press release highlighting its role in the MIT research. Both the ground-based methyl chloroform study and EOS are funded through NASA's Mission to Planet Earth (MTPE) effort. "Continued monitoring of ozone and the chemicals involved in ozone depletion will be **crucial** over the next several decades to ensure that the treaties continue to work, so that ozone levels ultimately recover," Robert Harriss, head of the Science Div. in the MTPE headquarters office, said in the agency press release yesterday.

**Ozone depletion causes extinction**

**Greenpeace 95** (Full of Holes: Montreal Protocol and the Continuing Destruction of the Ozone Layer -- A Greenpeace Report with contributions from Ozone Action, http://archive.greenpeace.org/ozone/holes/holebg.html)

When chemists Sherwood Rowland and Mario Molina first postulated a link between chlorofluorocarbons and ozone layer depletion in 1974, the news was greeted with scepticism, but taken seriously nonetheless. The **vast majority of credible scientists** have since confirmed this hypothesis. The ozone layer around the Earth shields us all from harmful ultraviolet radiation from the sun. Without the ozone layer, life on earth would not exist. Exposure to increased levels of ultraviolet radiation can cause cataracts, skin cancer, and immune system suppression in humans as well as innumerable effects on other living systems. This is why Rowland's and Molina's theory was taken so seriously, so quickly - **the stakes** **are literally the continuation of life on earth.**

## Turns Case – Mechanism

### CIR Turns – Cuban Relations/Engagement

#### CIR crucial to economic engagement with Cuba – now key

Kayyem 13

[Juliette, columnist at The Boston Globe, writing national security and foreign affairs, “Immigration Reform after Hugo Chavez,” New York Times News Service, Hawaii Tribune Herald, 3/10/13, <http://hawaiitribune-herald.com/sections/commentary/their-views/immigration-reform-after-hugo-chavez.html>]

The United States, which is comprehensively reassessing its immigration policies, has the capacity to change these hemispheric dynamics in its favor. Our efforts to strangle Cuba economically have served as a lightning rod for anti-American sentiment, allowing leaders like the Castros and Chavez to mask their own horrible records of corruption.¶ By eliminating the automatic refugee status granted to Cubans if they somehow reach U.S. soil, we would stop tempting them to take to the seas in rickety boats and inner tubes on which many lose their lives. We would also put the whole world on equal footing, determining which refugees are allowed to stay not by whether we like (or don’t like) their country’s leadership, but whether they have valid reasons to stay, including a fear of political reprisals. It is time we end a Cuba policy that has sowed ill will among our southern neighbors and non-Cuban immigrant populations in the United States.¶ At the same time, we can encourage more exchanges of people, and therefore commerce, between the two nations. We could then assist Cuba in making the political and economic reforms that we have been demanding for years. We shouldn’t punish Cuba for taking our advice. A healthier Cuba is only of benefit to the United States: The U.S. intelligence community has not viewed Cuba as a direct threat to our national security since the 1970s.¶ President Obama can have his own Berlin Wall moment. With Chavez gone, and Cuba so desperate, we can shift the relationship between the United States and South America to one of strategic interests rather than personalities. Chavez is dead. The Castros are exiting the stage. America should move on.

### CIR Turns – Latin American Relations/Engagement

#### CIR is THE issue

Shifter 12

[Michael, President of the Inter-American Dialogue, Adjunct Professor of Latin American Studies at Georgetown University's School of Foreign Service, “Remaking the Relationship,” Inter-American Dialogue Policy Report, April, <http://www.thedialogue.org/PublicationFiles/IAD2012PolicyReportFINAL.pdf>]

Still another advance could come through US immigration reform. By better ¶ aligning the supply and demand for workers in critical industries and opening new opportunities for millions of currently unauthorized residents, a ¶ more pragmatic migration policy would significantly bolster the US economy .¶ No other single policy measure would more clearly demonstrate US commitment to cooperation with Latin America . The comprehensive reform advocated by both the George W. Bush and the Obama administrations represents the best approach. More modest changes, however, could still be helpful

#### CIR shores up relations and allows extension of U.S. interests into Latin America

Meacham 13

[Carl, director of the Americas Program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies , “U.S. Immigration Reform: Good for the Americas?” CSIS, 6/13/13, <http://csis.org/publication/us-immigration-reform-good-americas-0>]

Q3: What does immigration reform mean for U.S. standing in the region?¶ A3: Latin American people and their governments are closely following the U.S. immigration debate. This should come as no great surprise, as its outcome has the potential to affect millions of Latin Americans, their families, and their future interactions with the United States.¶ Comprehensive immigration reform would be positively received among Latin American citizens and governments, especially in those countries from which the majority of the U.S. immigrant population originates. First and foremost, a bill that provides legal status to the 11 million undocumented immigrants living in the United States would help to reverse the region’s perception that the U.S. government treats Hispanics as second-class citizens, acknowledging what many feel is their existing right to U.S. residency and eventual citizenship.¶ Not unrelated is the effect comprehensive reform would have on the region’s governments. Because passing the bill would demonstrate the U.S. government’s willingness to work on issues important to its counterparts throughout the hemisphere—even when those issues stir up conflict at home—immigration reform could help redefine perceptions of the United States in the region; passing the bill would send the message that the U.S. government recognizes the region’s and its people’s importance in our own prosperity moving forward.¶ Conclusion: Though the political debate surrounding the issue has been heated, perhaps that is inevitable given the far-reaching implications of reform.¶ And while much of that debate has focused on border security and the U.S. economy, it is imperative that we keep in mind the work immigration reform would do in improving perceptions of the United States and advancing U.S. interests throughout the hemisphere.

#### Key to establish a framework for trade and economic relations

Pecquet 13

[Julian, Foreign affairs reporter, “Obama: No 'Senior Partners' in Relationship with Latin America,” The Hill, 5/4/13, <http://thehill.com/blogs/global-affairs/americas/297805-obama-no-senior-partners-in-us-relationship-with-latin-america#ixzz2WQkRan00>]

“The main message I have is the United States recognizes that our fates are tied up with your success,” Obama said at a forum on Inclusive Economic Growth and Development in Costa Rica following his meeting with central American government leaders. “We don't think there's senior partners or junior partners in that partnership. It's a partnership based on equality and mutual respect and mutual interests.”¶ Obama said his administration had two goals to take full advantage of the growing trade ties between the United States and Latin America, a rapidly growing region: comprehensive immigration reform and joint border security infrastructure projects on both borders.¶ “One of the arguments that we've made in pursuit of comprehensive immigration reform,” he said, “is that you can't separate out the dangers or challenges or concerns of a border from the enormous opportunities that a well-managed, well-regulated border represents."¶ “Let's make sure we have a sound system of immigration and customs and regulatory environment in cooperation with Canada and Mexico. And as much as possible, eases the flow of goods and people and services that are legitimate.”¶ Throughout his trip, Obama urged Congress to get immigration reform done “this year.” Reform advocates hope a bipartisan Senate bill will get an overwhelming majority in the coming weeks, creating pressure on House GOP leaders to bring the bill to a vote despite objections from some conservative Republicans who oppose a pathway to citizenship for the millions of immigrants in the country illegally.

#### And its reverse causal – immigration hurts relations

Shifter 12

[Michael, President of the Inter-American Dialogue, Adjunct Professor of Latin American Studies at Georgetown University's School of Foreign Service, “Remaking the Relationship,” Inter-American Dialogue Policy Report, April, <http://www.thedialogue.org/PublicationFiles/IAD2012PolicyReportFINAL.pdf>]

In the main, hemispheric relations are amicable . Open conflict is rare and, ¶ happily, the sharp antagonisms that marred relations in the past have subsided. But the US-Latin America relationship would profit from more vitality ¶ and direction. Shared interests are not pursued as vigorously as they should ¶ be, and opportunities for more fruitful engagement are being missed. Well-developed ideas for reversing these disappointing trends are scarce. Some enduring problems stand squarely in the way of partnership and ¶ effective cooperation . The inability of Washington to reform its broken ¶ immigration system is a constant source of friction between the United ¶ States and nearly every other country in the Americas. Yet US officials rarely ¶ refer to immigration as a foreign policy issue . Domestic policy debates on ¶ this issue disregard the United States’ hemispheric agenda as well as the ¶ interests of other nations

### A2: Bill Too Limited/Doesn’t Go Far Enough

#### ( ) Even partial immigration reform solves US-Latin American ties.

Shifter ‘12

(Michael is an Adjunct Professor of Latin American Studies at Georgetown University's School of Foreign Service. He is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations and writes for the Council's journal Foreign Affairs. He serves as the President of Inter-American Dialogue. “Remaking the Relationship: The United States and Latin America,” April, IAD Policy Report, http://www.thedialogue.org/PublicationFiles/IAD2012PolicyReportFINAL.pdf)

Washington’s failure to repair the United States’ broken immigration system is breeding resentment across the region, nowhere more sothan in the principal points of origin and transit: Mexico, Central America,and the Caribbean. Latin Americans find the idea of building a wall on theUS-Mexico border particularly offensive.Despite bitter political battles over immigration in the United States, there is general agreement about what sensible reform would include. It combines effective border and employer enforcement, the adoption of a general worker program consistent with labor market needs in the United States, and a path toward residence and citizenship for the estimated 12 millionunauthorized residents living in the country. This package is similar to the reform effort (unfortunately defeated in Congress) proposed under President George W. Bush. The complicated and divisive politics of the United States, compounded by the weakness of the US economy, have so far blocked this comprehensive approach. But more limited measures such as the Dream Act, allowingchildren brought to the United States without appropriate documentation an opportunity to qualify for citizenship, would not only be welcomed in US Latino communities and in Latin America, but it would demonstrate that the issue is being taken seriously and with a measure of compassion in Washington.

### CIR Turns – Mexican Economic Engagement

#### CIR a pre-req to economic engagement with Mexico

Condon 13

[Stephanie, syndicated Washington correspondent, “Obama: Immigration Reform Can Help Trade With Mexico,” CBS News, 5/2/13, <http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-250_162-57582650/obama-immigration-reform-can-help-trade-with-mexico/>]

Achieving immigration reform will help facilitate the growing economic relationship the U.S. has with Mexico, President Obama said Thursday in Mexico City.¶ It is unwise "for us to get constantly bogged down on these border issues," Mr. Obama said in a press conference with Mexican President Enrique Pena Nieto, "instead of... making sure legal immigration and legal trade and commerce is facilitated."¶ Mr. Obama said he's "optimistic" immigration reform will be passed in the United States. "If we're going to get that done, now is the time to do it," he said.¶ The U.S. president stressed, however, that his three-day trip to Mexico and Costa Rica this week focuses on the critical economic ties between the two countries. The two leaders today confirmed their commitment to concluding negotiations on the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) with Australia, Brunei, Canada, Chile, Malaysia, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore, and Vietnam. They also established ways in which they can broaden the bilateral economic partnership between the U.S. and Mexico.¶ ¶ Additionally, the two leaders announced the formation of a bilateral formation on higher education, innovation and research. They also made commitments on energy security and international relations.¶ "As Mexico works to become more competitive, you've got a strong partner in the United States because our success is shared," Mr. Obama said, noting that annual trade between the two countries has surpassed $500 billion. Mexico is the second-largest market for U.S. exports, and the U.S. is Mexico's largest customer.¶ The U.S. has an opportunity to boost Mexico's role on the world stage -- which would, in turn, benefit the U.S. -- and Mr. Obama commended Pena Nieto for pursuing reforms in areas like energy and labor law.¶ "What I have been impressed with is the president's boldness in his reform agenda," he said. "He's tackling big issues, and that's what the times demand. We live in a world that's changing rapidly... We can't be flat-footed as the world advances."

#### It’s the necessary in-road

Marczak 13

[Jason, director of policy at Americas Society and Council of the Americas, “Immigration Reform Gets U.S. in on Mexico's Boom,” CNN, 4/18, <http://www.cnn.com/2013/04/18/opinion/marczak-immigration-the-new-mexico>]

Mexico's future is bright, and tapping into this growth and economic prosperity is vital to U.S. competitiveness. But the U.S. needs immigration reform to build on its huge bilateral trade with Mexico -- more than $1 billion in goods and services each day, or $45 million an hour.¶ Mexico's President Enrique Peña Nieto has achieved in less than five months in office what eluded previous administrations for six years. In the second half of 2013, he hopes to add energy to the improvements in education and telecommunications that are sailing through under the umbrella of the Pact for Mexico political agreement.¶ Demographic and economic transformations in Mexico mean that the U.S. can expect the number of Mexicans coming into the U.S. to slow to a trickle. Mexicans make up about 58% of the 11 million in the U.S. without authorization.¶ The Pew Hispanic Center reports zero net migration from 2005 to 2010, with about 1.4 million Mexicans both entering and leaving the United States. Pew demographers even raise the possibility that the return flow may be exceeding the number of Mexicans coming north.¶ The reasons for the drop in Mexican migration are a combination of changes in the "push" and "pull" factors that determine migratory patterns. The decline in the "pull" factor is all too well-known -- it's no longer so desirable to migrate to the U.S. for jobs.¶ But Mexico's rise also means that going north is a less attractive option for getting ahead in life. Its economy grew at more than double the rate of the U.S. last year, with a projected 3.5% growth in 2013. Between 2005 and 2008, as noted in Americas Society and Council of the Americas "Get the Facts" series, the number of new Mexican businesses created each year increased by 27%, which is 2.5 times the G20 average.¶ Over the same period, the number of students in Mexico graduating from advanced university level programs increased by 11%.¶ 'Guardedly optimistic' on immigration Is immigration overhaul in sight? Rubio all in on immigration plan¶ If the February education reform, aimed at improving standards to boost the overall quality of education, is successful, more young Mexicans will have the training to compete in the 21st century workforce. In the past decade, the Mexican middle class grew by 17%, and in just two generations, the fertility rate dropped nearly 70% -- signaling the end of the youth bulge that contributed to the "push" to the United States.¶ Mexico is a hub of business activity. Despite the insecurity in certain parts of the country, Mexican entrepreneurs and foreign companies are setting up shop.¶ Guadalajara is fast-becoming Mexico's Silicon Valley with tech entrepreneurs from across Mexico flocking to the capital of Jalisco state. At the same time, as wages rise in China, firms are relocating their manufacturing options to Mexico, where wages remain competitive and where products have easier access to the U.S. and Canadian markets through the North American Free Trade Agreement.¶ Comprehensive immigration reform will open a gateway to one of Latin America's fastest-growing economies. By providing a pathway to citizenship for the undocumented immigrants of Mexican origin, reform will make it easier for laborers to cross borders, which will harness the competitiveness of both countries. It would also show that the U.S. is a true economic partner with Mexico and the rest of the Americas.¶ Legal status would open the door for these immigrants and their children to further increase their contributions to the U.S. economy and to start small businesses that would capitalize on their cross-border networks. This is a highly likely scenario as immigrants are more likely to start a business than those born in the U.S., and Mexicans represent the greatest number of foreign-born small-business owners.¶ At the same time, greater emphasis on a demand-driven visa system would create new ways for workers to enter the U.S. who will be increasingly needed as baby boomers retire.¶ Also critical for increasing cross-border trade is improving efficiency at the border. Any new border security plan should improve infrastructure and technology to reduce the congestion that delays trade. Improved trade means more U.S. jobs, with 6 million, or 1 in 24 jobs, across 22 states attributed to bilateral commerce.¶ Undocumented immigration will keep declining as more Mexicans find new opportunities at home. That means the big question for Congress to consider should be how to ensure that our immigration system helps North American competitiveness and prosperity, and how the U.S. can attract the workers -- including Mexicans-- it will need.

#### CIR unlocks a massive trade and economic agenda

Woodruff 13

[Judy, News anchor and journalist for NPR, “Obama Talks Trade, Security, and Immigration on Trip to Mexico, Latin America” NPR, 5/2, <http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/white_house/jan-june13/mexico_05-02.html>]

President Obama arrived in Mexico City this afternoon to shore up the U.S. relationship with its southern neighbor and second largest export market.¶ Immigration and security are also on the agenda, as the president begins his three-day Latin American trip. Shortly after Air Force One touched down in Mexico City this afternoon, Mr. Obama joined Mexico's new president, Enrique Pena Nieto.¶ PRESIDENT BARACK OBAMA: We can't lose sight of the larger relationship between our peoples, including the promise of Mexico's economic progress. I believe we have got a historic opportunity to foster even more cooperation, more trade, more jobs on both sides of the border, and that's the focus of my visit.¶ JUDY WOODRUFF: U.S. immigration reform will be a central piece of their agenda. President Obama wants Congress to approve a plan that would provide visas for seasonal workers, as well as a pathway to citizenship for the 11 million people now living in the U.S. illegally.¶ More than half are from Mexico, according to the Pew Research Center. At a November visit in Washington, then president-elect Pena Nieto voiced support for those proposals. But a key issue for Republicans is stepped-up security along the 2,000-mile shared border with Mexico and a stop to the flow of drugs, guns and crime.

### CIR Turns – Mexican Economy

#### CIR key to set up clearer border crossings

Woodruff 13

[Judy, News anchor and journalist for NPR, “Obama Talks Trade, Security, and Immigration on Trip to Mexico, Latin America” NPR, 5/2, <http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/white_house/jan-june13/mexico_05-02.html>]

JUDY WOODRUFF: But picking up on the economy, what can come out of this meet, Diana Negroponte, that would make things better?¶ DIANA NEGROPONTE: I would hope that they could reach some private-public partnerships to build access roads on the border.¶ Now, the border matters to trade. The border sees trucks and vegetables passing through each day, as well as human beings. But the logjam, the bottleneck is very bad. So if we can build with private money and public licenses some good access roads, we're going to facilitate trade.¶ JUDY WOODRUFF: You mean because -- it's tough because of the immigration issues?¶ DIANA NEGROPONTE: It's tough because each of those trucks will be examined by the CBP, the Customs and Border Patrol. So that creates bottlenecks, even though there are 53 points of entry. The volume of trade has quadrupled. We haven't opened enough border crossings. We need private investment there.

#### Immigration bill helps even the field

Lees 13

[Kevin, syndicated immigration and politics journalist, “How U.S. Immigration Reform Might Affect México,” Suffragio, 2/7/13, <http://suffragio.org/2013/02/07/how-u-s-immigration-reform-might-affect-mexico/>]

But the larger consequences of immigration reform, taken together with a strengthening Mexican economy, the government’s enthusiasm for additional foreign direct investment in Pemex, the state-controlled energy company, and the free trade zone established in 1994 by the North American Free Trade Agreement among Canada, the United States and México, will be to bring standards of living in México into greater parity with those in the United States.¶ When you think about what a 22nd century México looks like, it’s not hard to envision a place that is less dissimilar to the United States, which itself will become increasingly Latino and, especially ‘Mexican.’ In that sense, immigration reform would be one of several tools reducing the barriers between the U.S. and Mexican culturally and economically.¶ With a GDP per capita of around $15,000 in México to nearly $49,000 in the United States, it’s clear that México has some catching up to do. But the national average disguises the relative poverty of the more indigenous southern part of México — parts of the industrial north, the resort towns on the Caribbean and Pacific coasts, and the Distrito Federal all feature incomes and standards of living much closer to U.S. standards than the mean figure indicates.

### CIR Turns – Mexican Relations

#### CIR is a central focus

Woodruff 13

[Judy, News anchor and journalist for NPR, “Obama Talks Trade, Security, and Immigration on Trip to Mexico, Latin America” NPR, 5/2, <http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/white_house/jan-june13/mexico_05-02.html>]

¶ JUDY WOODRUFF: And picking up on that and picking up on the immigration point, Shannon O'Neill, we have seen reports in the last few days that President Obama, seeing that there's more opposition to immigration reform, there may not be as many undocumented immigrants in this country who -- for whom there will be a pathway to citizenship. How much is that on the agenda of these two presidents?¶ SHANNON O’NEIL: Well, they will be talking about this because it's an incredibly important issue for Mexico.¶ Mexico has some 11 million citizens living in the United States, roughly six million of those here without papers who are undocumented. And they care. They hope to improve the rights and abilities of their citizens here. But I don't see the Mexican government wading into the politics here, because they have seen before the failures of previous big comprehensive immigration reforms. And having the Mexican government or any foreign government step in what is often seen as a domestic policy issue. We won't see any big public announcements on it.¶ JUDY WOODRUFF: So, do you see them, Diana Negroponte, basically standing back and just watching with interest?¶ DIANA NEGROPONTE: They watch very closely. They follow our immigration debate in detail, but they do not want to interfere because they have, as a principle, a concept of sovereign noninterference. So we shouldn't interfere in their energy debate.

#### Immigration reform is the defining issue

San Diego Union-Tribune, November 20, 20**02**, Wednesday, Pg. B-8

But Mexican President Vicente Fox continues to bring up migrant reform. He considers it the defining issue in relations between Mexico City and Washington. "The American side is apparently arguing that security reasons are what is preventing them from moving forward on the issue," said Fox, in remarks carried by EFE, a news service. "But we think it is just the opposite. That for security reasons it is a good idea to legalize those Mexicans who work efficiently and productively and contribute to the growth of the American economy." Jeffrey Davidow, the former U.S. ambassador to Mexico, warned last week that Mexico's preoccupation with migrant reform risks damaging relations with its neighbor to the north. "I do think that dwelling on the lack of progress is actually counterproductive," he said, in remarks to the Inter-American Dialogue, a foreign policy group that focuses on issues concerning the Western hemisphere.

#### Guest worker is critical

Houston Chronicle ‘04

(11-22, Lexis)

The 21-nation summit focused on issues such as North Korea and Iraq, but Bush also sought to mend relations with Latin America, a region he rarely visited during his first term and where much of the public and their governments have opposed the U.S. presence in Iraq. Key to thawing relations with Mexico is a guest-worker plan that Fox has lobbied for since Bush was first elected. Earlier this year, Bush outlined a plan that would allow 8 million undocumented immigrants to be eligible for temporary legal status in the United States for at least six years, as long as they are employed. The proposal has been stalled in Congress largely because of opposition from conservative Republicans who fear it would end up a general amnesty for illegal immigrants.

## Link Alone Turns Case

**General/Engagement**

#### The link alone turns case – partisan infighting ensures the plan becomes a bureaucratic nightmare

Whitehead & Nolte 12 (Laurence Whitehead, senior research fellow in politics at Nuffield College, Oxford, and Detlef Nolte, acting president of the GIGA, director of the GIGA Institute of Latin American Studies, professor of political science at the University of Hamburg, Number 6, 2012, <http://www.giga-hamburg.de/dl/download.php?d=/content/publikationen/pdf/gf_international_1206.pdf>, CMR)

Who Decides on the United States’ Latin ¶ America Policy?¶ Latin Americans familiar with vertical and often ¶ highly personalized systems of presidential governance often assume that the US political system ¶ shares these features. It can be difficult to accept ¶ that despite polite diplomatic discourse, in reality their country’s priorities and appeals do not really register within the White House. In practice, ¶ a lower level of bureaucratic politics determines ¶ the great bulk of the policy interactions between ¶ the USA and its neighbors. Of course, there is always an appearance of presidential coordination ¶ through the White House and the National Security Council, but in practice these central agencies ¶ cannot monitor effectively on all fronts and tend ¶ to focus on no more than a limited set of urgent ¶ priorities. The majority of Latin American politicians more or less understand the role of certain ¶ agencies – the Pentagon, the CIA, and the Drug ¶ Enforcement Administration – although they often assume that their policies are more centrally controlled than is generally the case. However, there is less understanding of the huge variety ¶ of distinct and relatively autonomous Washington ¶ institutions that can impinge on foreign policymaking, and still less understanding of how difficult coordination between them can be. ¶ When President Carter prepared an agenda for ¶ a high-level summit with Mexico’s president Lopez Portillo in 1979, he appointed a special ambassador, the experienced Democratic veteran Robert Strauss, to help him. This was an ambassador ¶ from the White House, not to Mexico but to all the ¶ other Washington agencies with entrenched policy interests in Mexico. The task was to work out ¶ what the US Department of Agriculture, the Bureau of Mines, the Congressional Subcommittee on Irrigation, and the state authorities in Texas, among others, would ask for and were prepared to offer in the course of an overall bargaining session with the Mexican government. Similar coordination problems arise with other Latin ¶ American countries, or groups of countries, and ¶ if anything the partisan gridlock in contemporary ¶ Washington makes these difficulties even more intractable now than in the past.

**Link alone turns case – undermines effectiveness and causes *functional* rollback**

**Haass 00** – Richard N. Haass, Vice President and Director of Foreign Policy Studies at the Brookings Institution, and Meghan L. O’Sullivan, Fellow with the Foreign Policy Studies Program at the Brookings Institution, “Terms of Engagement: Alternatives to Punitive Policies”, Survival, 42(2), Summer, p. 13

Building support at home **Engagement strategies often fail** not simply because of disagreements between the US and the country it is engaging, but **because American domestic political considerations warp the strategy or make it untenable**. **Détente** between the US and the Soviet Union **is the best case in point**. Kissinger and Nixon carefully crafted their ‘linkage’ strategy, where the Soviet Union would be offered political and economic incentives in return for restrained behaviour in the strategic arena. This trade-off did encourage Brezhnev to negotiate and sign significant arms-control agreements, and certainly, some of the agreements and the summits at which they were signed accorded the Soviet Union much desired increased political status. However, Kissinger’s capacity to pursue détente was damaged by the inability of the Nixon administration to deliver the promised trade concessions. While Kissinger and Nixon had promised the Soviet Union MFN trading status in return for its cooperation in other global arenas, **they failed to convince Congress of the importance** of this deal. **As a result, Congress passed the Jackson-Vanik amendment,** which linked MFN status to the internal behaviour of the Soviet regime. **This move tied the hands of Kissinger and helped undermine the strategy of détente**. Although the strong backing of domestic public opinion will always be valuable to those implementing an engagement strategy, **the support of Congress and** representatives of **key constituencies** and businesses **is critical to success.** Securing support for engagement among these key actors in democratic societies requires intense coordination between various branches of government. As the case of North Korea aptly illustrates, **engagement strategies are too often hindered by executive efforts to evade congressional involvement and congressional attempts to thwart executive endeavours.** From the perspective of the executive branch, a strength of the Agreed Framework was that it was not a treaty with North Korea. While this technicality spared the agreement from the necessity of Senate ratification, Congress later asserted itself through its reluctance to finance commitments made under the accord.

**Takes out solvency --- the plan would be incoherent**

**Hamilton ‘03**

(Lee, Director of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Washington Quarterly, Spring)

Few words in politics are bandied about as much as bipartisanship. All politicians recognize that, like freedom or prosperity, its approval ratings approach 100 percent. Yet translating rhetorical support for bipartisanship into practice can be extremely difficult. Although Americans have consistently said that they want their elected officials to work across party lines, **the nation's politics have been excessively partisan** over the past several years**. U.S. foreign policy has suffered as a result. Foreign policy always has more force** and punch **when the nation speaks with one voice**. **When the president works with the opposing party** and takes its views into consideration, the policy that results is more likely to have strong public support. **Such a foreign policy makes the** **U**nited **S**tates **more respected and effective abroad**. The United States is at a remarkable moment in its history. The international environment is relatively tranquil; there is no major threat to our security; and we enjoy a position of unprecedented economic, political, and cultural preeminence. We must not, however, take these good times for granted. Most Americans have barely begun to comprehend threats now on the horizon. **To remain secure**, prosperous, and free, **the** **U**nited **S**tates **must continue to lead. That leadership requires a president and Congress working together to fashion a foreign policy with broad, bipartisan support**. **[Continues]** Developing a bipartisan foreign policy will not be easy under any circumstances. We should expect rough patches, but, if Bush takes charge of U.S. foreign policy, reaches out and consults with Congress, builds on the areas of broad agreement, and works hard to reduce the friction around contentious issues, a strong bipartisan foreign policy could emerge. **A foreign policy of unity is essential if the United States is to promote its** values and **interests effectively** and help to build a safer, freer, and more prosperous world.

**destroys U.S. negotiating credibility**

**Winik ‘91**

(Jay, Senior Research Fellow – National Defense U. Foundation, Washington Quarterly, Autumn)

At the very core of the debate, however, lies an even more fundamental issue. Can the spirit and practice of bipartianship that enabled this country to lead the Western democracies with coherence and unity of purpose for four decades be recaptured? If not, and **if the continuing breakdown of bipartisanship goes on unchecked, the** creative **U.S. international achievements** that have culminated in the demise of the Soviet empire **may well be sacrificed**. Equally important, the opportunities available not just to end the Cold War but to win the peace may be squandered at this remarkable, perhaps even defining, point in world history. Indeed, it can be argued that the need for a sense of rededication of effort is no less urgent today than when the wise men of both political parties assembled with a sense of dire urgency in the aftermath of World War II to create a bipartisan foreign policy and rally the nation behind the burdens of global leadership. It is true that there is scarcely a U.S. policymaker or legislator who does not pay lip service to or believe that the restoration of bipartisanship is a priority. Yet for all this sentiment, success in forging bipartisanshp in all likelihood will be far more elusive than it was in the wake of the world war, when the fate of the industrialized democracies literally hung in the balance. This point has largely been overlooked by policy analysts or drowned out by the din of world events in the last year. It is crucial, then, to understand the nature of the domestic divisions -- the breakdown of executive-legislative relations, the philosophical chasm between the two political parties, and the absence of firm political leadership -- that are fracturing the country and have reduced bipartisanship to the lowest common denominator. Only then can the United States move on to create a bipartisan policy that will enable it to provide the leadership and purpose made necessary by the opportunities and pitfalls that lie ahead on the international scene. The U.S. stake in speaking and acting with one voice is enormous. Two former secretaries of state, themselves of different political parties and holding different political ideologies, have warned: The American national purpose must at some point be fixed. If it is redefined -- or even subject to redefinition -- with every change in Administration in Washington, the United States risks becoming a factor of inconstancy in the world. . . . Other nations -- friend or adversary -- unable to gear their policies to American steadiness will go their own way, dooming the United States to growing irrelevancy. n2 The Need for Bipartisanship in the New World Order The urgent need for creating a new bipartisanship is also an acknowledgment of the changed international system. In the early 1950s, the United States produced 52 percent of the world's gross national product. It enjoyed a nuclear monopoly and was without question the world's preponderant power militarily. The past 40 years, however, have witnessed a relative decline in U.S. wealth, dictating that the United States can no longer simply overwhelm any problem with its vast national resources. Economic realities have also changed domestic political realities, forcing the country to make very real choices between guns and butter and to establish its priorities. Indeed, in the absence of a bipartisan consensus on the role of the United States in the world, public sentiment -- including among certain foreign policy elites -- is already calling for the United States to turn inward. The fact is, however, that the twilight of the Cold War actually creates a greater need for bipartisanship as the United States confronts a more anarchical international system. The transition of the postwar blocs from East-West bipolarity to multipolarity will significantly alter the structure of the international arena, making conflict more, not less, likely. With the passage of time, Japan and a reunited Germany will almost certainly emerge as more assertive and independent actors pursuing their own national interests. China will continue to be a major player on the world stage and will have great sway over world events. Furthermore, as the two superpowers continue on the path of arms control and scale down their military efforts, as anticipated, the gap between their capabilities and those of rising powers will diminish significantly. Additionally, by the year 2000, at least a handful of new countries will possess long-range delivery systems and weapons of mass destruction, and greater numbers of countries, including rogue states that do not adhere to or respect traditional standards of deterrence, will possess crude but nonetheless similarly daunting weapons. These countries will be capable of terrorizing other states or of sowing general chaos in the international system. The result will be a new international system characterized by highly dynamic interaction and, over time, shifting alliances and interests more akin to the strife-ridden European balance of power system than the twentieth-century system, in which peace has been enforced by the nuclear balance of terror between the two superpowers. Although the risk of cataclysmic nuclear war between the United States and the Soviet Union is at its lowest point in history and is likely to remain so, it is far from certain that this new international structure will be more stable than the one it replaces. Fixed lines between allies and adversaries will blur, and alliances will shift with greater regularity across different issues. At the same time, these changes will occur against the backdrop of a Soviet Union in decay, itself a potential cause of vast instability; the existence of nuclear weapons; and rising nationalistic, religious, and ethnic strife stretching from Europe to the Middle East to Southeast Asia. To use Kaiser Wilhelm's words, the world may once again be made safe for "jolly little wars," the difference this time being the existence of weapons of mass destruction. There are few -- and really no -- parallels in history to serve as a model or paradigm for guiding U.S. policymakers in an international setting of this kind. Thus, at a time when bipartisanship is at its lowest ebb, U.S. policymakers are now being challenged in more ways intellectually, politically, diplomatically, and militarily than during the past 40 years. The United States does have the resources to continue to play a major world role and to deal with its domestic problems at the same time, although admittedly those resources are now constrained. In addition, when one looks at military, economic, and even cultural factors, the United States has no challenger to its position as the preeminent world power should it choose this role. The problem for the United States is clearly not that epitomized by the apocalyptic cries of the "decline school" as portrayed by Paul Kennedy -- that is, decline following upon "imperial overstretch." n3 Rather, the problem the United States faces is an international system in flux, characterized by the diffusion of military capabilities and power abroad, all of which will create far more complex, nuanced, and unpredictable challenges. In the future, deterrence of conflict will be more difficult, and U.S. defense planners and diplomats will have to address the capabilities and intentions of a wide array of actors far beyond that of the Soviet Union alone. Threats to U.S. interests and those of its allies will often appear ambiguous, falling in the greyer areas of "not war, not peace." Rather than following the well-defined and clearly understood rules of the road that largely governed U.S.-Soviet relations, the U.S. political system will have to react to the varied crises of the new world order. Even when working at its smoothest, it will have difficulty doing so effectively. Small-scale Sarajevos and Munichs may well be the norm, and their prevention or containment will require a cohesive nation, acting with a clear and consistent voice in the international arena, which will only happen if a new bipartisanship is forged. Thus, it is demonstrably clear that**, in the absence of bipartisanship, dealing with the** new **international system will be** difficult at best and at times next to **impossible. Friends and foes alike, watching U.S. indecision at home, will not see the United States as a credible negotiating partner**, ally, or deterrent against wanton aggression. **This is a recipe for increased chaos**, anarchy**, and strife on the world scene**. The appeal, then, to recreate anew as the hallmark of U.S. efforts abroad the **predictability and resolve** that **can only come from bipartisanship** at home is as critical as during the perilous days following World War II.

**Loss of Congressional support tubes solvency**

Jonathan **Power**, M.Sc in economics, columnist, associate at the Transnational Forum for Peace, August 6, **2001**, Toronto Star, “Can Powell guide U.S. to quiet diplomacy?” p. Lexis

**Engagement, because it is a slow process, depends on the cultivated support of a** well-prepared **domestic base. When Carter tried to normalize relations with** ex-enemy **Vietnam, he came up against the antagonism of Congress and** the **vociferous criticism** of veterans' lobbies**.** Years later, **Clinton had more success because he had carefully solicited influential congressional leaders and**, with the judicious use of American aid and the incentive of lifting sanctions, **persuaded** Hanoi's **leadership to comply with U.S. demands**.

**Democracy**

**Congressional Opposition and partisanship undermine plans credibility**

**McFaul, ‘6** (David Adesnik is a member of the research staff at the Institute for Defense Analyses.

Michael McFaul is the Helen and Peter Bing Senior Fellow at the Hoover Institution;

director of the Center for Democracy, Development, and Rule of Law at Stanford

University; and a nonresident senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington Quarterly, Spring)

Second, words mattered, especially when they were the president’s and even more so when they enjoy **bipartisan support**. A **consistent message** coming out of the White House and echoed throughout the offices of the executive branch as well as on Capitol Hill is the **best way** to convince friendly dictators that the United States is **serious about democracy promotion**. **Even while acknowledging** a general **U.S. commitment to democracy**, dictators still bend over backward to find evidence that the United States is willing to tolerate their regime. Well aware of the U.S. government’s penchant for alliances with friendly dictatorships, political leaders will **look for any indication** that either the U.S. president or some of his most influential advisers are not serious about reform. To be **credible and effective**, the message must be **communicated by all U.S. government offic**ials and sustained over a period of years. The worst scenario is when one cabinet official gives a speech categorizing democracy promotion as a U.S. priority while another downplays the significance of this mission. Such **mixed messages** in the early years of the Reagan administration, especially when the message of support for anti-Communist autocratic regimes came out of the White House, encouraged autocrats that they were too vital to U.S. security interests to be challenged to change. All too frequently, when dealing directly with their counterparts from other countries, diplomats working in-country or closely with a specific country over time tend to soften the message of democracy sent by higher ranks in the government. These lower-level officials believe that they need good contacts in foreign governments to get “more important” business done. Their winks and nods about democracy promotion lead to the unintended consequence of undermining their superiors’ credibility, including that of the president.

**Link alone turns the entire case**

**Norris, 11** (John Norris is the Executive Director of the Sustainable Security and Peacebuilding Initiative. 3/18, <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/03/rising_to_the_occasion.html>)

The question is: What do our leaders need to do—to the degree that we can influence events—to help guide the region down the path to democracy and stability instead of chaos? **First and foremost**, we need to channel the late Republican Sen. Arthur Vandenberg of Ohio, who argued that politics should stop at the water’s edge. In other words, we need to **dial down the partisan sniping** here at home. The president and Congress need to work together. If we get it wrong in the Middle East, both parties and the American people will reap that ill reward for years to come. Accordingly, the administration should pull in members of Congress, former national security officials of both parties, and other foreign policy experts on a regular basis. These should not be briefings but discussions about how best to navigate the incredibly tricky path before us. The administration needs to be less insular in its decision making and members of Congress need to avoid the cheap thrill of feeding the 24-hour news machine pithy tweets and a steady diet of second guesses. Indeed, it is truly astounding that we may be lurching toward a government shutdown in the middle of the most important events on the international stage in decades. Members of both parties need to understand full well that the American public will view our politicians as spoiled 12-year-olds if they shutter the government at this moment. Is partisan gridlock really the **message we want to broadcast to protesters** across the Middle East **as t**hey risk their lives fighting for the same freedoms we already enjoy? Second, our strategy needs to be clearly communicated to the public. It is encouraging that President Barack Obama is taking to the airwaves tonight to explain our military involvement in Libya and our stakes across the region. The president needs to be communicator in chief during this period and he needs to speak honestly of the risks and rewards as we move forward. At all costs, the administration needs to avoid the trap of thinking that its strategy is too complex to be understood by the general public. If you can’t explain your strategy, it probably isn’t a good one. By the same token, pundits should stop the ridiculous clamoring for a clearly identified endgame for every move the president makes. We are seeing an entire region in upheaval. We have seen protests in 21 countries with a population of more than 425 million people stretching across 4,800 miles. Things will be messy and uncertain for some time. Finally, and perhaps most dauntingly, the United States needs to manage its relationships with several longstanding Middle East allies while not betraying democratic aspirations in these countries. Nations such as Yemen, Bahrain, and Saudi Arabia have long been key partners in the region but we cannot let that mute our criticisms of what are highly autocratic systems. The administration realized that reform had gained powerful momentum in both Tunisia and Egypt and that it would be counterproductive to be seen as defending antidemocratic regimes. The strategic stakes are even higher in a country like Saudi Arabia. But we need to keep the heat on some of our friends to rule far more democratically even when it produces discomfort for all involved. The Middle East has been hurtled through a period of incredible change during the last three months. Millions of people have marched in the face of armed opposition to speak out and demand their rights. There can be no better time for the United States to **demonstrate its own maturity as a democracy** by speaking clearly, listening to a diversity of voices**, cooling the partisan rhetoric**, and understanding that such historic moments are few and far between.

**Latin Relations**

**The link alone turns case. Partisanship wrecks US-Latin American ties.**

**Shifter ‘12**

(Michael is an Adjunct Professor of Latin American Studies at Georgetown University's School of Foreign Service. He is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations and writes for the Council's journal Foreign Affairs. He serves as the President of Inter-American Dialogue. “Remaking the Relationship: The United States and Latin America,” April, IAD Policy Report, http://www.thedialogue.org/PublicationFiles/IAD2012PolicyReportFINAL.pdf)

**The most ominous change in the U**nited **S**tates **has taken place in the political realm**. **Politics have become less collaborative. It is increasingly difficult to find common ground on which to build solutions** to the critical problems on the policy agenda. **Compromise**, the hallmark of democratic governance, **has become** an **ebbing** art, **replaced by gridlock and inaction on challenges that would advance US national interests** and well-being. In part **as a result of these shifts**, **US-Latin American relations have grown more distant.** The quality and intensity of ties have diminished. Most countries of the region view the United States as less and less relevant to their needs—and with declining capacity to propose and carry out strategies to deal with the issues that most concern them. In the main, hemispheric relations are amicable. **Open conflict is rare** and, happily, the sharp antagonisms that marred relations in the past have subsided. **But the US-Latin America relationship would profit from more vitality** and direction. Shared interests are not pursued as vigorously as they should be, and opportunities for more fruitful engagement are being missed. **Well-developed ideas for reversing these disappointing trends are scarce.**

**Mexico**

**Link alone turns case – collapses signal and credible support -- Material engagement alone insufficient –**

**Cardenas and Noriega, 12**

Roger F. Noriega, José R. Cárdenas, American Enterprise Institute, 12/5/12

Roger F. Noriega (rnoriega@aei.org) was a senior US State Department official from 2001 to 2005. He is currently a visiting fellow at AEI and managing director of Vision Americas LLC, which represents foreign and domestic clients. José R. Cárdenas (jrc@visionamericas.com) is a contributor to AEI’s Venezuela-Iran Project and a director with Vision Americas, http://www.aei.org/outlook/foreign-and-defense-policy/regional/latin-america/an-action-plan-for-us-policy-in-the-americas/

In the final year of the George W. Bush administration, **Mexico and the U**nited **S**tates **agreed on a $1 billion** counter-narcotics **assistance** package. Yet, despite the enormous opportunity this presented to bring Mexico and the United States into a closer **and mutually** beneficial security **cooperation,** the aid was so slowly delivered that **Mexicans have been left to wonder if their** raging drug war **is a priority for the U**nited **S**tates. Conservative lawmakers who were the driving force behind Plan Colombia a decade ago have been less active on Mexico, focusing instead on border security as a means to fight illegal immigration and leaving Mexicans to square off with bloodthirsty cartels on their own. It is time for the United States to more fully recognize that “Mexico’s drug war” is more accurately “America’s drug war” that Mexico is fighting. The US Department of Justice says that Mexico’s drug-trafficking organizations are the greatest organized crime threat in the United States. The US must suppress demand for illicit drugs through education, treatment, and law enforcement, but **helping Mexico** sustain this fight **is** an **indispensable** responsibility as well. Moreover, **increased US bipartisan political support may encourage the Mexican people and their new president**, Enrique Peña Nieto**, to sustain their** **antidrug efforts to advance the two countries’ common security, stability, and prosperity**. **The U**nited **S**tates **should also provide** robust and innovative **material support** for these efforts and institutionalize law-enforcement cooperation and information sharing that are essential to the common fight against transnational criminal groups. In Central America, the institutions of government and the rule of law have been overwhelmed by the onslaught of criminal gangs that have been displaced by Mexico’s stepped-up law enforcement. Guatemala’s state apparatus has been underfunded for decades, and the institutions of Honduras have been weakened by a succession of populist caudillo presidents, systematic corruption, and the expanding presence of organized crime. El Salvador confronts the unique challenge of hardened gang members deported from the United States maintaining their ties to criminal networks in US urban centers. A public-security crisis in these countries has undermined popular confidence in elected officials and overwhelmed poorly trained and equipped security forces. Unless the United States and neighboring countries organize an international response, several of these countries may soon become ungovernable territories, producing economic failure, civil strife, and refugee crises. This challenge requires a regional rescue plan (led by the United States, Mexico, Colombia, Europe, and the multilateral development banks). The United States should encourage interested nations to organize a summit of governments and institutions to develop such a plan and agree on how it should be implemented and funded. But by far the greatest threat to security and stability in the Americas is the narco-state that has taken root in Venezuela under the unaccountable regime of Hugo Chávez. This hostile regime is managed by Cuba’s security apparatus, funded by China, armed by Russia, and partnered with Iran, Hezbollah, and Colombian and Mexican narco-traffickers. US law enforcement and federal prosecutors have gathered fresh, compelling evidence implicating senior Venezuelan officials and Chávez himself in narcotics trafficking in collusion with Colombian terrorist groups. Chávez has also forged an important strategic alliance with Iran to allow it to evade international sanctions and carry its asymmetrical threat against the United States to the country’s doorstep. Even as the international community implements new financial sanctions to deny Teheran the means to sustain a uranium enrichment program, the regime has established dozens of shadowy commercial enterprises and banks in Venezuela to launder as much as $30 billion through its petro-economy. Certainly the drug kingpins managing Venezuela today have everything to lose when Chávez succumbs to cancer. Several ruthless, anti-United States governments have a stake in trying to engineer a chavista succession, even as the government struggles with an unsustainable fiscal situation, a collapsing economy, social polarization, and a public-security crisis. In short, within the next several years, Venezuela will become a manmade disaster that will impact regional security and energy supply. America’s current policy of evading responsibility for the implosion in Venezuela is untenable and dangerous. Every serious government in the Americas has a stake in addressing these issues before they become unmanageable. The crises in Central America and Venezuela will require US leadership, intelligent diplomacy, and resources to organize an effective multilateral response. **The following are recommendations** for addressing these issues, listed by country or region. The Americas: Renew emphasis on intelligence capabilities and mission to confront extraregional threats and cross-border criminality; Increase dialogue with regional and European military, intelligence, and security agencies on common threats; Direct US Northern and Southern Commands, the US Coast Guard, and the US Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) to provide “surge” engagement plans for additional funding and other support; Ensure better cooperation from the US State Department with law enforcement and intelligence efforts. Mexico: **Develop strong bipartisan support in the US Congress for Mexican** counternarcotics **efforts** and for treating Mexico as not just an “enforcer” but an ally against drug trafficking cartels, and emphasize common “North American” strategies; Set up an interagency US-Mexico financial crimes unit based at the US Treasury to improve targeting of organized-crime money-laundering operations to cripple the financial solvency of the cartels.

**Trade/Protectionism**

**Link turns case – sends mixed message emboldening protectionism – policy alone isn’t enough – rhetoric matters**

**Okezie, ‘10**

Okezie Chukwumerije, Professor of Law, Thurgood Marshall School of Law, Texas Southern University, Houston, Texas, 5/19/10, <http://jilp.law.ucdavis.edu/issues/Volume%2016.1/Chukwumerije%20MACRO.pdf>

This article evaluates the implications of the emerging trade policy of the Obama administration. The article begins by sketching a picture of the administration‟s trade-related initiatives and situating them in the context of the trade objectives articulated by the president during the last presidential election. The article then examines the trade aspects of the administration‟s stimulus and economic recovery programs. It focuses on their consistency with U.S. international trade obligations and with the long-standing commitment of the United States to a free and open multilateral trading system. The article further explores the **policy and political considerations** that would **affect the implementation of the trade-related aspects of the administration‟s** environmental and labor protection **initiatives.** The article concludes with the caution that Obama‟s **mixed messages on trade, measured by** his **rhetoric and policies, are detrimental to the pro-trade reputation of the United States and** might **embolden protectionists, both within and outside the United States**.

**Political support is the vital internal link**

**Stokes, 7**

Stokes, international economics columnist for the National Journal, 2007

(Bruce, “Resistance to Trade Liberalization Has Deep Political Roots,” State Department Documents and Publications, January 22, Lexis)

**The politics of trade are** also **driven by** the public's **profound ambivalence toward international commerce**. In principle, people worldwide think globalization is good for their families and for their countries. In 25 of the 44 nations surveyed by the Pew Global Attitudes Project in 2002, majorities of at least 60 percent thought that globalization was a good thing. Africans, who live on the poorest continent, were the most upbeat. Seven in 10 respondents in Uganda said greater international commerce was good for their nation. Roughly two-thirds of Nigerians agreed. Meanwhile, more than half the Vietnamese, whose economy is the second-fastest growing in Asia, thought that internationalization had been good. A more recent survey by the German Marshall Fund found ambivalence about trade in Europe and the United States. Seven in 10 Americans favored international trade in 2006, up from two-thirds in 2005. And even more Europeans, three out of four, supported trade, up from two in three. But more than half the French and nearly one-third of Americans do not favor freer trade. And half the Germans and three-fifths of the Americans and the French think freer trade costs more jobs than it creates. Overall, **it would seem that Americans** and Europeans **are free traders in principle and protectionists in practice. The same people endorse free trade as a philosophical concept and also support tariffs on steel imports**, for example, **if those tariffs will protect local jobs**. The tragedy of protectionism is the economic cost it imposes on national economies, especially poor ones. Recent studies by the World Bank conclude that removal of protectionist barriers in developing countries has increased growth between 1.2 and 2.6 percent. Moreover, trade liberalization has been followed by acceleration in investment and exports of goods and services. These **economic benefits notwithstanding, the political roots of protectionism and its long history suggest that barriers to trade will remain an impediment** to economic well-being for some time to come **and that protectionism will have to be addressed politically if it is to be overcome.**

**Undermines US trade leadership**

**Economist, 08** (10/8)

Both the risks of this new protectionism and the odds of it being countered depend heavily on the relationship between America and the biggest emerging economies. As the Doha malaise has shown, active American leadership, although no longer sufficient, is still necessary for multilateral progress. Yet the politics of trade has become increasingly difficult in America, **compromising the countrys ability to take the lead.** Support for more open markets is weaker than almost anywhere else in the world. According to this year?s Pew Global Attitudes Survey, only 53% of Americans think trade is good for their country, down from 78% in 2002. Several other surveys in America suggest that supporters have become a minority. In other countries support is far higher. Some 87% of Chinese and 90% of Indians say trade is good for their country, along with 71% of Japanese, 77% of Britons, 82% of French and 89% of Spaniards.

# SORT

### Narratives

#### Immigrants must be allowed to tell their stories; will be important factor in making immigration more of a critical social issue

Haussamen 7/6/13 (Heath / New Mexico In Depth “Immigrants' stories are key to reform effort,” Las Cruces Sun-News (New Mexico)July 6, 2013, l/n)

LAS CRUCES Standing before a crowd of more than 500 people and several television crews, Alejandra Gomez choked up as she tried to speak.¶ The 22-year-old immigrant, a Mexican citizen living in the United States without legal status, raised her left hand to her face and wept. A number of political and religious leaders sat behind her on stage.¶ The crowd was silent as Gomez took a deep breath, then spoke about the two empty chairs at family gatherings. Some in the friendly crowd at the May 1 event cried with Gomez as she described the hole the deportations of her brothers Reymundo, 22, and Julio, 20 leaves in her heart.¶ Gomez's brothers may not have the most compelling story to tell during a rally designed to shift public and political opinion in favor of immigration reform that grants legal status to most or all of the estimated 11 million people living in the United States without proper documentation. The two were deported last year after being arrested for stealing scrap metal. They're being deported again after they were caught earlier this year trying to re-enter the United States illegally. ¶ But there Gomez was, telling her brothers' story during the Las Cruces rally. The faith-based immigrants-rights group Comunidades en Acci-n y de FÈ (Communities in Action and Faith, or CAF ), sponsored the event. U.S. Sen. Martin Heinrich, who sat behind Gomez on stage, told New Mexico In Depth later that reform wouldn't help Gomez's brothers because of their criminal backgrounds.¶ Her brothers aren't bad people they were just trying to make ends meet, Gomez responded in an interview with NMID. So she pushes on, telling her brothers' story as a way to keep hope.¶ At the Las Cruces rally, Gomez called her brothers' decision to take metal from property they thought was abandoned a mistake. She said they tried to come back to the United States to flee drug dealers in Ju·rez who threatened to kill them if they didn't sell for them.¶ Toward the end of her speech, Gomez turned to Heinrich, a Democrat who has been supportive of allowing a path to citizenship or other legal status for immigrants living here without proper documentation. Seated behind her on stage, one leg crossed over the other, his hands in his lap, Heinrich locked eyes with Gomez as she spoke.¶ "I just want you to know this is not a joke," a crying Gomez told Heinrich. She later told NMID she was directing her frustration at the senator because, at the rally, he was the highest-ranking representative of a government whose broken immigration system, in her view, rips families apart.¶ The federal government's past refusal to fix its immigration system, Gomez said, exacerbates difficult situations that drive immigrants to make mistakes like the crimes her brothers committed.¶ Heinrich stood and applauded along with others in the crowd when Gomez finished speaking. She turned from the podium into a hug from a friend.¶ Trying to 'propel the immigration debate forward'¶ Across the nation, immigrants like Gomez are trying to influence the ongoing immigration debate in Washington by sharing their stories. They've been encouraged by reform backers including President Barack Obama, who met with a group of young immigrants in May. Following the meeting, the White House urged immigrants "to continue to share their stories with the American public to move the hearts and minds of individual leaders and to propel the immigration debate forward."¶ So-called dreamers like Gomez and her brothers immigrants who were brought to the United States illegally as children have become the public face of the immigration reform movement. People often find their stories more sympathetic than those of other immigrants because they didn't choose to come here illegally, said U.S. Sen. Tom Udall, who met with Gomez and other immigrants during a tear-filled meeting in April.¶ Udall, D-N.M., pointed out that a procedural block killed legislation that would give permanent residency to dreamers several years ago even though majorities in the House and Senate voted for it. The majority votes indicate the support dreamers enjoy even from Congress.¶ By humanizing the issue, dreamers are helping lead a lobbying effort Udall, Heinrich and others say they hope will give comprehensive reform a greater chance than the last time Congress considered it.¶ In 2007, a fragile compromise crumbled because some on the right opposed anything that could be called amnesty and others on the left disliked a new guest-worker program they said might have negative effects on wages and unemployment.¶ Then-U.S. Sen. Jeff Bingaman of New Mexico was among the Democrats who helped kill reform that year because of his concerns about the guest-worker program. But times have changed. Heinrich and Udall told NMID that doing nothing again this year isn't an option.¶ Because of that belief, many Democrats are more willing to compromise than they were in 2007. They understand they have to find compromise with the GOP-controlled U.S. House. And Hispanics are becoming a more important voting bloc one Republicans are heavily courting and Democrats can't afford to lose.¶ Dreamers have the numbers to be a significant lobbying force. The nonprofit Immigration Policy Center estimates that, of 85,000 immigrants living in New Mexico without legal status, there are almost 13,000 who qualify for Obama's deferred action program or may in the future. The Pew Hispanic Center estimates there are as many as 1.7 million nationally who meet the requirements for the program, which grants work permits to immigrants if they were brought here illegally as children and meet other criteria, including not having felony or certain misdemeanor convictions on their records.¶ But whether dreamers can give immigration reform the momentum advocates are seeking isn't clear. The Senate passed a reform bill last month that provides a path to citizenship for most immigrants living illegally in the United States. Reform faces a more difficult road in the Republican-controlled House, where Speaker John Boehner says he'll only allow a vote on a bill that has support of at least half of Republicans.¶ Many House Republicans, including Steve Pearce of New Mexico, oppose the Senate bill and talk about securing the border before tackling other aspects of reform. Meanwhile, a provision in the Senate-approved bill that devotes $30 billion to deploying 20,000 new Border Patrol agents and adding hundreds of miles of fence along the border has angered many reform advocates and may lessen support from the left.¶ Neil Harvey, who heads the government department at New Mexico State University, isn't sure this year will be different than 2006 and 2007, when immigrants marched in cities across America but Washington failed to act. He said dreamers have put immigration reform "back on the political agenda" this year, but "negotiations through Congress are another matter."¶ 'Eventually something is going to sprout'¶ Cynthia Alba is similarly skeptical. The 18-year-old Mexican citizen shared her story earlier this year with Pearce in a meeting organized by CAF , an organization that has focused for months on building support in southern New Mexico for immigration reform.¶ Using a birth certificate belonging to another child, Alba's mom walked with the 2-year-old across a bridge between Ju·rez and El Paso more than 15 years ago. They've lived in the United States ever since.¶ Alba applied for and received deferred action status last year. She is working legally for the first time. While she's worried that Congress won't act on immigration reform and that the next president might revoke her deferred action work permit, she said having deferred action makes her feel safer. It protects her from deportation, at least for now.¶ "I can't be swept away immediately," Alba said.¶ Now that she can travel through the Border Patrol checkpoints around Las Cruces without fear of deportation, Alba said she wants to visit a dense, green forest, perhaps in Washington State. She's never seen one in person.¶ During an interview with NMID at her mother's home in La Mesa, Alba said she told Pearce she and her mother struggled with loneliness when they came to the United States because they were leaving family. Others who cross without any documentation through the desert risk death, she said.¶ Alba told NMID she doesn't believe the meeting affected Pearce's views. She said it's difficult to argue with something Pearce told her and other CAF activists at the meeting. As Alba quotes it, Pearce told CAF , "If we offer the dream to everyone, soon enough there won't be a dream."¶ Pearce told NMID he sympathizes with dreamers such as Alba who are "basically Americans." He said he hears their stories constantly, and called Alba's a "very sad situation." But there are lots of people in the world with more tragic stories than Alba, and the United States can't be the haven for the billions of people on the planet, Pearce said.¶ Pearce proposes focusing on securing the border and streamlining the legal immigration system before offering legal status to those who live here without proper documentation. After the first two objectives are reached, he said he would let most immigrants who lack proper documentation stay if they want legal residency to work. Most or all who want a path to citizenship, he said, should return home and get in line.¶ There isn't a lot of common ground between what Alba wants and what Pearce proposes. CAF and other activists are quick to point out that Washington has focused on security for years. They claim the border is secure.¶ Alba said she doesn't know how to bridge the gap and doubts Congress can do it this year. She said she met with Pearce "to keep the dream alive" so that, at some point down the road, reform will be possible.¶ "It's like if you keep watering an empty pot, with soil, why keep watering it? Because eventually something is going to sprout. It may not be what you expected, but it's there. It's life," she said.¶ 'I can't help my own family'¶ Gomez refuses to give up hope that reform is possible this year. She has been working with CAF as she seeks change.¶ She first shared her family's tale publicly at a news conference in Washington, D.C. in February. Because she lacks legal status, Gomez can't travel through border checkpoints around Las Cruces by car without fear of deportation. But she was able to fly from El Paso to the nation's capital thanks to her New Mexico driver's license. New Mexico is one of several states that lets immigrants, regardless of legal status, obtain licenses.¶ Family members brought Gomez and her brothers across the Rio Grande to El Paso when they were small children. She lives in Anthony, N.M., today, and hasn't returned to Mexico since. Neither had her brothers, until they were sent back last year to their country of citizenship a place Gomez said was, for all practical purposes, foreign to them.¶ The two struggled to find work in Ju·rez, Gomez said. She learned that they tried to re-enter the United States when one called her family from jail earlier this year. Gomez noted that an American citizen who was with her brothers when they took the scrap metal is out of jail. That's another aspect of the situation she said is unjust the only difference between being released on bail and being imprisoned until deportation is legal status.¶ Asked about Heinrich saying reform won't help her brothers, Gomez was silent for a moment. When she spoke, she fired her words quickly, anger in her voice. She said she loves fighting for immigrant rights, but doesn't think it's fair that she can't help her brothers live without fear of deportation in the nation they consider their home.¶ Though it's probably too late for Reymundo and Julio to have a shot at such a life, Heinrich said he hopes for reform that empowers immigrants to make better choices than Gomez's brothers did.¶ "Maybe the next time a couple of teenagers don't find themselves in that kind of position in the first place, and have hope and focus on the future," Heinrich said.

### Immigration bill uniqueness

#### Republicans unclear as to which action to take now;

CBS News 7/6/13 (Jul 06, 2013 (What will the House do on immigration reform?

CBS News:http://www.cnet.com/ Delivered by Newstex, l/n)

¶ For some conservative House Republicans, immigration reform is the strange uncle that drops by for a surprise visit: No one invited him, and everyone wants to get him out the door.¶ ¶ Worst of all, nobody's quite sure what to do with him while he's here. ¶ ¶ ¶ ¶ When a broad bipartisan majority of senators passed a comprehensive immigration bill[1] last week, they handed a series of uncomfortable questions to Republicans in the lower chamber, who have voiced problems with nearly every provision in the Senate bill. They believe there's not enough of a guarantee on border security. They worry an influx of foreign labor will depress wages and crowd the domestic job market. Many fundamentally object to the idea of extending a path to citizenship to undocumented immigrants.¶ ¶ Given those objections, as Congress returns from its Fourth of July break next week, how will House Republicans react to the hot potato that's just been dropped in their lap? If they won't pass the Senate bill, but they still hope to forge an agreement with the upper chamber, which proposals will be watered down or amped up? And what might those alterations mean for the bill's future?¶ ¶ House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, is fond of saying that the House will "work its will." But where immigration is concerned, the will of the House remains murky at best.¶ Immigration bill sails through Senate, has little hope in House[2] Immigration bill's border focus leaves some liberals wary[3] Goodlatte pushes "step-by-step approach" to immigration reform in the House[4]¶ ¶ The Senate bill allocated billions of dollars[5] in additional technology and manpower for the Border Patrol, and it required the full implementation of new border security measures before undocumented immigrants could begin traveling the path to citizenship, a proposal hailed by some conservatives who have demanded border security as a precondition of broader reform efforts.¶ ¶ Some, however, objected to the bill's immediate provision of an interim legal status to undocumented immigrants as they await their green cards and an eventual path to citizenship.¶ ¶ ¶ ¶ "The Senate bill gives amnesty first and then says let's work on border security," said Rep. Trey Radel, R-Fla., according to the Sun Sentinel[6]. "What I would like to do is see our border secured first and then work on a different paths for the 11 million that are here and, more importantly, reform our legal immigration system."¶ ¶ Rep. Bob Goodlatte, R-Va., the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, told Bloomberg News that while the Senate bill amps up border security, "none of that will take place until [undocumented immigrants have] already been given the legal status."¶ ¶ "The legal status comes immediately, and we think that most people who are not here legally, that's the main thing they want," he explained. "They want to have a legal status here, and that's a worthwhile objective, but we think it shouldn't happen until you have the assurance that we're not going to have another wave of illegal immigration occur ahead of time."¶ ¶ At a news conference the day the Senate passed its bill, Boehner said any immigration reform that passes the House must be "grounded" in a guarantee of border security. "People have to have confidence that the border secure before anything else is really going to work," he said.¶ ¶ To assuage concerns among conservatives, House lawmakers may insist on a more stringent set of triggers and refuse to provide an interim legal status - let alone a green card or a path to citizenship - to undocumented immigrants until the federal government fully secures the border.¶ ¶ During the Senate debate, Sen. John Cornyn, R-Texas, offered an amendment that would have instituted that additional threshold. It was broadly supported by conservatives but ultimately voted down by Democrats and a handful of Republicans. Whether the Senate would be willing to revisit that fight in conference with the House remains to be seen.¶ ¶ ¶ ¶ ¶ Perhaps a more vexing problem, many House Republicans object to the very idea of providing a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants. They argue that citizenship is too great a privilege to confer on people who came here illegally, that it would encourage further illegal immigration, and that it would send the wrong message to those immigrants who followed the rules.¶ ¶ "I object" to a pathway to citizenship, Goodlatte told Bloomberg News, "because that pathway to citizenship is something that people who have gone through the process legally do not have the opportunity to have, and people who come here illegally get that special pathway to citizenship."¶ ¶ Goodlatte pitched a path to legality, not citizenship, that would give undocumented immigrants "many opportunities" while avoiding the impropriety of rewarding people who cut the line.¶ ¶ After border security and employment enforcement measures are implemented, undocumented immigrants would "get only a legal status," Goodlatte said, "It would give them many, many opportunities, but it wouldn't give them something that people who have historically immigrated to the country legally don't have, and I don't think they should have either."¶ ¶ Boehner has not tipped his cards on the likelihood of a House bill including a path to citizenship, saying he does not want to prejudice or impede the legislative mechanics underway.¶ ¶ If Goodlatte has his way, the House and the Senate are likely headed for a collision course. Supporters of the Senate bill have warned that immigration reform without a path to citizenship will not pass Congress. Many immigration reform advocates, already leery of the border security measures[7] in the Senate proposal, have warned against any further changes viewed as hostile to immigrants.¶ ¶ If lawmakers can't bridge the divide over a path to citizenship, someone has to give, or the process falls apart.¶ ¶ In the end, the most consequential outstanding question is how far Boehner will go in accommodating the concerns of his base as the House crafts its immigration bill. If he reaches a point at which he believes the House has moved too far away from the Senate's proposal, he will face a choice: He could risk torpedoing the reform process entirely by passing a conservative bill on a party-line vote that would likely die in conference with the Senate. Or he could move a comprehensive bill to the floor of the House for a vote, even without the support of a majority of Republicans, potentially inviting a conservative insurrection.¶ ¶ Several House Republicans have already threatened to depose Boehner if he schedules a vote on an immigration bill without the approval of a majority of his conference. And thus far, Boehner has given no indication that he plans to move a bill without his troops behind him. "I don't see any way of bringing an immigration reform bill to the floor that doesn't have the majority support of Republicans," he told reporters in June.¶ ¶ Still, Boehner bristled at the suggestion that he would make any legislative decision based on a concern for his own political future. "I didn't come here to be Speaker because I needed a fancy title and a big office," he said. "I wanted to be Speaker so I could do something on behalf of the country."

### Immigration key to Republican identity

#### Republicans have allowed the Democrats to claim the moral high ground; immigration is key issue for Republicans to claim party identity

Limbaugh 7/2/13 (David, writer, author and attorney. His latest book, "The Great Destroyer," reached No. 2 on the New York Times best-seller list for nonfiction.Human Events Online, “The GOP's Identity Crisis”, July 2, 2013, l/n)

HIGHLIGHT: If Republicans truly believed in themselves and fought with the same conviction as Democrats, it would be a different story.¶ As one who supports traditional values and a conservative political agenda, I'm more worried about the right wing's erosion of resolve and moral courage than I am about the left's relentless assault on our values and ideas.Surely, no one can dispute that the political left has been tirelessly chipping away at America's foundational values for years and ruthlessly demonizing conservatives. But if Republicans truly believed in themselves and fought with the same conviction as Democrats, it would be a different story.One might attribute the attrition of America's foundational institutions to the political application of the laws of entropy. Things just have a natural tendency to descend into chaos. Great empires and great nations can't last forever. ¶ But it has to be more than that. When those who claim to want to preserve this nation's greatness all but throw in the towel, the destructive process can't help but accelerate. How can a political party remain viable when many of its leaders are obviously ashamed of major parts of its platform? When its leaders validate negative stereotypes by promising to change? When he was running for his first presidential term, George W. Bush said that he was a "compassionate conservative" and that he wouldn't balance the budget "on the backs of the poor." As much as I admire President Bush, I regret those statements, as they communicated the false message that ordinary conservatives aren't compassionate and that we don't have a heart for the downtrodden.Some of Bush's former advisers are still wagging their fingers at conservatives today for their alleged mean-spiritedness on many issues, including immigration, urging them to be more winsome or loving -- or something, anything but conservative.Regrettably, Republican National Chairman Reince Priebus told Latinos in Chicago that Republicans have reshaped their outreach. "In America, it doesn't matter where you come from; it matters where you're going," said Priebus.What? The Republican Party has always stood for equal opportunity and articulated a nondiscriminatory, pro-growth message. Why would the party's leader thus validate Democratic slanders portraying the GOP as nativist?Why couldn't he have said instead, "Democrats will tell you that we don't care about Hispanics, but the truth is we care about all people, and our policies are geared toward unleashing robust opportunities for all, irrespective of race, ethnicity and gender"?Every day, we see examples of liberals painting Republicans as uncompassionate, racist, sexist and homophobic, with precious little blowback from our side. In the face of liberal propaganda, many Republicans are frozen into silence. Others are affirmatively apologetic for the embarrassing "extremists" in the party, who are anything but.This self-hatred that characterizes a substantial segment of the party has real consequences. Consider the stunning reversal in popular support for same-sex marriage, from 30 percent in 2004 to 53 percent today. Do you really believe that many people have changed their minds about an important issue overnight or, if so, that they have done it after deep soul-searching? Isn't it more likely a result of the right's failure to stand up to the left's constant bullying and its depiction of those who oppose same-sex marriage as anti-gay rather than as those who believe in the importance of preserving traditional marriage as a foundational societal institution? If Republicans had been affirming their beliefs with confidence and unity, would Supreme Court Justice Anthony Kennedy have been as likely to twist the Constitution into an inedible pretzel to invalidate the Defense of Marriage Act and, worse, to disgracefully castigate traditional marriage proponents as manifesting a "desire to harm a politically unpopular group"?Of course not. Through its silence and moral cowardice, the GOP has given a green light to those in positions of power to obliterate societal pillars and personally vilify those who dare defend them.In or out of power, Republicans seem always to be on the defensive, effectively apologizing for a) their insistence on securing the nation's borders -- assuring everyone they're not racist -- b) their opposition to Obamacare, pleading with people not to believe they don't care about those falling through the cracks, c) the so-called pro-life extremists instead of properly asserting the moral high ground as defenders of the innocent unborn, and d) those in the party who refuse to cower to liberals who deify junk science about man-made global warming instead of taking it to Obama for trampling conventional energy sources and the economy in allegiance to their superstitions. Democrats are the ones who should be on the defensive today, having destroyed the economy, bankrupted the nation, undermined our national defenses, made an incoherent mess of our foreign policy, sabotaged our health care system, polarized the nation and assaulted our religious liberty, the Constitution and the rule of law. But you never see them even considering apologizing for who they are and what they stand for. Democrats never lack moral courage, even in defense of immoral positions. Republicans are terrified of their own shadow; until they relearn how to be comfortable in their own skin, their troubles will continue.

1. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)